

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE CHURCH'S OPPORTUNITY IN ENGLAND

By CARDINAL BOURNE, Archbishop of Westminster.

TO gauge the openings that the Church may now find for the extension of her activity in England, it is well to recall how her work has been and must always be done everywhere, and how she once accomplished her task in England.

In the Church the full revelation of her Founder and Ruler, Jesus Christ, is manifested for all to know. Her mission is without limitation of century or of nation. At the same time this revelation entrusted to her keeping must, in order that it may have its effect for the salvation of souls, be brought home to the individual. Unless men, one by one, be brought within its influence, it cannot effect its Divine purpose. It is to be preached to all alike; but it is only those who accept it, separately and personally, who can draw from it the fruit of the Redemption which it contains in infinite abundance for all. To put it in another way, if the Church is to do her work, and to make available for men the teaching of which she is the guardian, and the sources of grace of which she is the custodian, she must establish contact between herself and every rank of human society, and of each one of the men and women contained in all those varied ranks. Her message is indeed broadcast, but it is effectual only to the extent to which that message is caught up by the individual solitary ear. The mission of the Church is, therefore, to establish *contact* between her teaching and

each one of the units which build up the vast multitudes of mankind with their manifold ramifications of nation, language, caste or class. When contact fails between the Church and any nation, or any section of any nation, or those who comprise those sections, the external work of the Church is neutralised in that regard. The internal work, of which the Holy Ghost is the worker and the witness, is, of course, ever in operation independently of such external contacts. Hereafter the wonderful secrets of that direct Divine intervention will be made known to all who one day shall see God face to face. But we are dealing here solely with the visible public work of God's Church.

From the beginning of the Apostolic preaching this was clearly the aim of the heralds of the new Gospel, to get into touch with men and women of every rank and position from the lowliest to the highest; and, by transforming them, gradually to transform the world. History tells us the extent of their success, and the way in which their successors carried out the same transformation in nation after nation, little by little diffusing throughout the whole body of the nation the teaching, the principles, and the influence of the Gospel.

Nowhere, perhaps, did the Church more effectually establish such universal contact as here in England. By the accession of Henry VIII the work begun in 597 had been long accomplished. The Church was in living contact with the whole of that England which she herself had unified and made. From the Court downward, through Parliament, the landed classes, the trading bodies, the industrial centres, to the lowliest serf in the twelve thousand parishes which ministered to the spiritual needs of all, there could not have been a section of society, nor an individual in any section, that was unconscious of the living vital contact of the Catholic Church. Not all listened to her voice, not all hearkened to her teaching, not all lived according to her precepts, not all were worthy of her; but not one could be unconscious of her presence, nor unaware of the claim which she made upon his conscience. Then, beginning under Henry VIII and reaching its definite form under Elizabeth, comes the break in this vital contact between the Catholic Church and the people of England; a break never total and complete, yet rendering contact so weak-

ened and intermittent and paralysed that many must have thought that contact lost for ever.

So far as the Government was concerned every effort was made to render the breach final and irremediable. The Church allowed episcopal government to lapse in England for a long period of years, though we now know that this policy was far from being in accordance with the clearly expressed opinion of the last survivor of the ancient hierarchy who, doubtless, was the exponent of views very widely held.¹ Thus the work, wonderful and practically complete, of a thousand years, was brought to a standstill and almost, but never wholly, destroyed.

Since that day the unceasing effort of the Catholic Church has been to re-establish the old contact between the English people and her Divine life-giving influence. It began with incredible difficulty. A fierce and relentless persecution on the part of the Protestant Government, and the reluctance of the Holy See to maintain Bishops in England—a reluctance the reasons of which are not yet capable of full discovery, while it is difficult to divine them—made the task well-nigh hopeless, and

¹ Extract from a letter written by Bishop Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, dated Rheims, 13th July, 1580 :

" . . . Nevertheless if Your Holiness is of a different opinion I will make the attempt, even though it should cost me my life. Still it would be impossible for me alone to supply the needs of all those Catholics, who are many thousand more than I had thought, and in almost every part of the kingdom. The most, I think, I possibly could do would be to supply for the City of London and some miles round it. And therefore in my ignorance I cannot but wonder that, when God has given your Holiness the grace to plant, as it were, anew and to maintain the Catholic faith in that kingdom, you make such great difficulty about creating there three or four titular Bishops to preserve and propagate it, although this might be done at as little cost as your Holiness pleases; since God has so inclined the minds of those priests to spend their lives in helping to bring back that kingdom to the Catholic faith, that, if they were made bishops, they would be content to live as poorly as they do now, just as the bishops of the primitive Church did.

" May God inspire your Holiness to do whatever shall be most for His honour, and prosper you many years. I humbly kiss your feet."

(Bishop Goldwell died April 3rd, 1585. His age and his health had made it impossible for him to return to England. William Bishop, Bishop of Chalcedon, was not consecrated until 1623.)

humanly impossible. For this our Martyrs lived and died; for this thousands lived in penury, sacrificing with heroic perseverance their substance and their worldly prospects. But the contact was, I repeat, never completely lost. The English people were never allowed to forget the existence of the Catholic Church. They were never permitted to remain without some opportunity of becoming reconciled to her, of embracing her faith, of submitting to her authority. Never did the Church cease to assert in England her divinely given rights. Never was there a time when Holy Mass was no longer offered up in England. Without interruption our Catholic forefathers carried on their twofold work of maintaining contact with the people of this country wherever it still existed, and of re-establishing it whenever and wherever it was possible to do so.

Gradually the opportunities, so scanty and restricted in the sixteenth and seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, became wider and more frequent. The Congress held last year gave occasion to trace and mark this growth of opportunity, and of the use made of such opportunity, since the granting of Catholic Emancipation in 1829.

If we look now definitely to the future we see that our progress must always be on the same clearly marked plan. First we have to maintain the contact with our fellow-countrymen which has already been set up. Secondly we have gradually to create similar contact in the directions in which it does not yet exist. To these two ends we must continue to turn all our energies; and then leave the results in the hands of God Who alone can ultimately guide and bring to acknowledgment of His claims, those for whose sake we initiate and develop all our endeavours.

The two lines of progress necessarily often converge and unite. It is hardly possible to maintain contact without simultaneously creating it in some new direction. At the summit of all ecclesiastical progress is the intensive action of the hierarchical government of the Church. This was in the mind of Pius X when by the Letters Apostolic *Si qua est*, issued in 1911, he created two new Provinces, with the avowed object of thereby rendering easier an increase in the number of Episcopal Sees, a policy already abundantly justified by results in the two instances where it has been actually carried into

effect. All the world over—and our Anglican friends have shown themselves fully aware of this fact—a prudent multiplication of episcopal centres means rapidly augmented progress. Next in order must come the setting up of new parishes, or quasi-parishes, or missionary centres; primarily to hold in faith and practice our scattered Catholics, but also to give greater opportunity to those who are not Catholics, of recognising the existence and claims of the Catholic Church, and of ascertaining what she really teaches. Wherever means of maintenance are forthcoming, and a priest is available, it is well to have a Catholic centre in every town and larger village for this one object of establishing a fresh contact between the Church and our fellow-countrymen. Nor must be forgotten the value in God's sight of Mass once more said in places whence it has been so long banished.

The statement made recently by Mr. Vernon Johnson that he had lived his Anglican life practically without contact with any Catholic influence, came as a great surprise to very many. It is a salutary reminder of how much remains to be done before the bulk of our people is in any sort of touch with the Catholic Church. The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom, in sympathy or in actual conjunction with various diocesan organizations, is doing admirable work with this important object. Another excellent method has been adopted in the diocese of Southwark, worthy of imitation in similar circumstances elsewhere, namely, that of sending forth itinerant missionaries to visit at intervals those smaller localities in which it is still impossible to place a resident priest. It is not necessary to dwell further on the progress which depends upon the prudent increase in the number of bishoprics and of parochial centres.

A great part of our work is essentially concerned with maintaining contact where it already exists. Hence the really heroic long-sustained efforts to build primary schools for our Catholic children, so that they may be brought up in the knowledge and practice of their faith. The struggle has now entered on a new phase which may have far-reaching results. Central schools and continuation schools, clubs, sodalities, scouts, rovers, guides, catechists, all make for this great purpose—to keep in touch with the Church those who acknowledge her

authority. In no respect has progress been more notable than in the very marked growth of secondary schools for boys. Owing to the initiative of the diocesan clergy, supported by our ever generous laity, and to the self-sacrificing labours of religious bodies, of Priests or Brothers, many thousands of Catholic boys are now receiving a secondary education who in former days would have been obliged either to be content with an elementary education, or to seek a higher kind of teaching in non-Catholic surroundings. Many more such secondary schools are needed. In no direction is still further progress more urgent.

There is much to be done, and counsels are divided as to the form of doing, for our young people during the anxious and perilous years of adolescence. That there is leakage no one can deny. Where the world, the devil and the flesh are in full activity, there must be a falling away. It has been so from apostolic times; and inevitably it will be so till the end. But every effort must be made to lessen it; and, above all, to prevent it becoming a definite and permanent loss. Experienced pastors of souls have the consolation not infrequently of seeing the return to faithful practice of those who were once counted as victims of the leakage. The provisions laid down by the Holy See thirty-five years ago for the safeguarding of the faith of Catholic students in residence at the ancient Universities, are being gradually extended to the more recently created university centres. There is, however, still need of greater activity in this respect; and many difficulties have to be overcome.

All the above-named undertakings are mainly concerned with keeping those who are already Catholics under the active influence of their religious convictions. The vast majority of the people of this country do not share those convictions, and consequently stand outside their influence. A great part, therefore, even though a subordinate part, of the work of the Church must be to come into contact with the vast, still uninfluenced multitude. She has already at her disposal many auxiliary agencies, all doing an admirable work, and all capable of indefinite extension as men and means become more abundantly available.

First among such agencies is undoubtedly the Catholic Truth Society which, by its excellent publications, has

made possible contact between the Catholic Church and non-Catholics to an extent that no one can calculate. Could the Catholic Truth Society set up in every town of England and Wales a bureau for enquiry and information, and the sale of publications, such as the *Christian Scientists* and other similar bodies frequently possess, a very great gain in influence would be secured. I have sometimes suggested that, if suitable maintenance could be found, such a bureau might be fittingly entrusted to a competent married convert clergyman, who therein could find scope for capacity and zeal. Many would undoubtedly more readily seek advice and counsel in a bureau of this character when they first begin to turn hesitating thoughts in the direction of the Catholic Church. Such seeking would appear to them more non-committal than direct approach to a Catholic priest. The first approach in such cases is often surrounded by apprehension.

The Catholic Evidence Guildsmen go forth boldly to make contact with non-Catholic England. In a few years' space they have done a very important work capable of boundless extension. Given their present admirable spirit they are destined to be a very important factor in the growing progress of the Church.

The Catholic Social Guild, with a smaller membership, a necessarily more restricted scope, and too straitened resources, ought nevertheless to become an increasingly powerful agent in extending the influence of the Church. Social questions are perplexing the minds of many who, if they can be brought to see that the Church has an answer to their questionings, will be led to listen to her voice on other matters.

The Catholic Missionary Society, now for many years under the zealous leadership of Father Herbert Vaughan, has for its definite object to come into contact with non-Catholics, to explain the teaching of the Church to them, to listen to their questions, to answer their objections, to remove the prejudices which obstruct their approach to the Catholic Church. With few members it has carried out its mission all over the country, and has been the precursor of many a new centre or parish. This, too, is a work capable of very wide expansion as opportunity arises, and is an element of ever extending progress.

There is one other direction in which much has yet to be done, and, perhaps, the time is not yet fully ripe for it, namely, the establishment of closer contact between the higher teaching of the Catholic Church and the higher intellectual thought of this country. I alluded to this matter in my address at the Congress held in Birmingham in 1926. Such intercourse would, of course, be confined to a comparatively small number, but it would be of immense value in its consequences. Limited opportunities for such contact of this character are, of course, to be found or made in every place where normal social or intellectual relations bring appropriate minds together.

There are many other ways in which Catholics may exercise influence; and thus, indirectly at least, restore contact between the Church and the people of this country. The presence of Catholics in Parliament, on Town Councils, in the various other Councils and Committees which carry on different departments of public service, and in every sort of State or municipal employment, establishes such contact to some extent. While loyally and faithfully discharging their duty in these capacities, Catholics possessing as they do a knowledge of a definite religious standpoint, are able to elucidate many a question which can be answered satisfactorily in the light of Christian teaching. Protestants oftentimes welcome the opportunity of making themselves thus acquainted with the Catholic point of view. There are, indeed, thousands who are prepared to be guided in many things by the clear utterance of Catholic principles. In this way large numbers accept the influence of the Church long before they are ready to submit themselves fully and openly to her authority. To an increasing extent there is in this manner a growing contact between the mind of the Catholic Church and the rest of the nation. The same may be said of those who are engaged in journalism, in the fine arts, in literature, in the learned professions, in every branch of mercantile enterprise. They all have a circle of influence in which, if they know and practise their religion, they bring the Catholic Church nearer to their colleagues, friends or acquaintances.

In thus briefly sketching the lines on which progress may be made by the Catholic Church in England, and in

rapidly alluding to some of the chief agencies on which the Church may rely in advancing that progress, I do not forget the forces upon which all work for God ultimately rests—prayer, union with, and complete dependence upon Him. By them all can be living factors in this progress; the child in his Catholic home, the boy or girl at the school desk, the seminarist in his secluded life, the novice in a cell, the priest in the obscurity of his lowly parish, the religious men and women in the devotedness of their consecrated lives, the faithful laity, poor and rich alike, who pass so often unperceived, and, unseen, make life fragrant with their hidden virtues—all together they are building up again a Catholic life in England. In proportion to their numbers and to their fervour will the day be hastened when the Catholic Church shall once again be brought into vital contact with men and women of every degree in our native land.

A NEWMAN SYNTHESIS

By THE REV. HENRY TRISTRAM, Cong.Or., B.Litt.,
M.A.

J. H. Kardinal Newman, Christentum, Ein Aufbau, von Erich Przywara, S.J., und Otto Karrer, S.J. (Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder and Co., 1922.)

A Newman Synthesis, arranged by Erich Przywara, S.J. (London, Sheed and Ward, 1930.)

“THE illustrious convert is, in fact, one of the masters of the present generation, and few thinkers have contributed as much as he has done towards the creation of what may be called the general atmosphere of contemporary theology.” This significant assessment of the position occupied by Newman in contemporary thought comes from the pen of one who is singularly well qualified to judge and to estimate—l’abbé Jean Rivière.¹ His influence he ascribes to two factors: (1) His enunciation of the principle of development, which has gradually worked its way into the forefront, until it now dominates certain important fields of theological research; and (2) his insistence on the importance, in the sphere of apologetic, of the individual’s *motivum credibilitatis*, based on his moral experiences and religious intuitions, which has contributed to the recognition of the necessity that the psychology of religion should be investigated more profoundly and with greater precision.

It is certainly curious to discover Newman numbered among “the masters of the present generation,” although “time, as it ages, teaches all the truth”; for since 1845, if not from some years before, he has suffered a long period of eclipse. Anglicans did not read his works, because they regarded him as a renegade, and Catholics did not, because they doubted, in spite of their recognition of his genius, whether he had anything to tell them which they had not learnt before. The newspapers did not even condescend to sacrifice any of their space to review, or even to notice, his books.

The *Apologia*—the enduring result of a controversy that would otherwise have been forgotten—secured for him a

¹ Le Modernisme dans l’Eglise. Etude d’histoire religieuse contemporaine, p. 84.

unique position in the esteem and affection of his fellow-countrymen. But that position was not in any way attributable to the fact that he had written much on many subjects. It may be doubted whether the appearance of the *Grammar of Assent* excited more than a slight ripple of interest, except amongst those who felt bound to rebut its arguments and to refute its principles.² Yet, with a confidence born of faith in the future, Newman set himself to the laborious task of preparing for the press a Uniform Edition of his works. In this edition they did not find a ready sale, although an exception must be made in the case of the *Parochial Sermons*, of the first volume of which more than 3,500 copies were sold in less than six months.

Newman, himself, was dubious about the wisdom of republishing his Anglican books: "Unless you had broken the ice," he wrote to Copeland, who had edited the *Parochial Sermons*, in April, 1873, "I could have republished nothing which I wrote before 1845-6. The English public would not have borne any alterations—and my own people would have been much scandalized, had I made none. They murmured a good deal at the new edition of the *Sermons*, as it was—but, since you, not I, published them, nothing could be said about it. After this beginning, I took courage to publish my *Essay on Miracles*, and the *British Critic* essays, uncorrected, but with notes corrective of the text. This too made some disturbance, but very little. And then I published . . . my *University Sermons*; and then I went on to mix Anglican and Catholic essays together; and now I have no criticism on these measures at all."³ Nevertheless, during the closing decades of his life, and particularly after his elevation to the Cardinalate, he did exert a considerable personal influence, more extensive than is commonly supposed, especially over individuals and in circles far removed from the Church. With his death, of course, that influence, in so far as it was personal, ceased, and with it seemed to pass any lien that all great thinkers have upon the future. One factor, in part responsible for this eclipse, was the delay in the appearance of his biography

² It received a welcome from W. G. Ward in the *Dublin Review* (*Philosophy of Theism*, II, 244-272), from R. H. Hutton in the *Spectator*, and from J. B. Mozley in the *Quarterly Review* (*Lectures and other Theological Papers*, 275-300).

³ Ward II., 396, n. 2.

—a delay of more than twenty years. It came to be suspected that his life as a Catholic was being, of set purpose and for some very solid reason, left shrouded in mystery, and that the veil would never be lifted. But even when the biography had been published, and when they had all the materials for judgment before them, the critics, as a body, failed to grasp his true measure as a thinker—not as a theologian, or a philosopher, or a historian, or anything else in particular, but as a thinker in many diverse or related departments of thought. Yet here and there a few students—comparatively very few—fostered a secret cult, and they only for certain isolated portions of his work, which happened to coincide with the main trend of their personal interests. To the majority he seemed as remote, as infinitely remote, as Victorianism was remote, and as negligible.⁴

However, as it has been observed, “a man is not completely born till he be dead.” To France belongs the credit of having first rescued Newman from oblivion. The French put him forward as a force to be reckoned with; but unhappily, even perversely, they directed their investigations to wrong ends. Modernism, riding for a fall, claimed him as a precursor, and orthodoxy, no less wayward, singled him out as a target for criticism. But the cloud that threatened to obscure Newman’s fair fame was not without its silver lining. The modernist short-lived and partial triumph has proved of great service, for as Przywara points out, just as Baianism and Jansenism led to a clearer comprehension of St. Augustine’s thought, so modernism, with its immanentist apologetic, has contributed to the right interpretation and deeper realization of Newman’s teaching. Germany entered second upon the field of Newman-study, but has contributed most to his rehabilitation. With characteristic thoroughness translations of many of his important works have been published, and the *Grammar of Assent*, the *Development of Doctrine*, the *Apologia*, the *University Discourses* and several others of his volumes now appear in a strangely unfamiliar German dress. There is something almost epic in the picture of a German literary man, Theodor Haecker, pursuing, during the dark days through which

⁴ Rivière pertinently remarks, quoting from Bremond, that until the close of the century Newman was more appreciated as a controversialist than as a theologian, and that the essential doctrines of Newmanism aroused no interest.

Germany passed at the end of the war, his laborious task of translating the *Grammar of Assent* from a copy of the first edition in a public library at Munich. It reminds the reader of Hegel's abstraction from the world and of his concentration on his philosophical work during the Battle of Jena. England has lagged behind, unconscious of the rich heritage she has received from the century within whose limits Newman's life fell. But, "abstract investigations and controversial exercises," as Newman himself observed, "are distasteful to an Englishman"; and yet "ideas," which result from these same abstract investigations and controversial exercises, "are the life of institutions, social, political, and literary." Newman's works constitute an inexhaustible storehouse of ideas, which we have inherited, and neglected. It is sad to think that Newman is more honoured abroad than at home, but perhaps it is not too much to hope that the truth discovered in Germany may at last dawn upon England.

Among German interpreters of Newman, Father Erich Przywara, S.J., occupies the foremost position, and stands without a rival. Probably the line of filiation between him and Newman passes through Father Christian Pesch, S.J., an exile in England during the Kulturkampf, or as a result of the Kulturkampf, and subsequently Przywara's master in Theology. But certainly the pupil has made for himself an exhaustive study of Newman's works, and has mastered their contents to a degree little short of marvellous, especially if we recall the fact that they are written in what is to him a foreign language. It is no light task for an Englishman to make himself at home in them, to be so familiar with them, that parallel or corresponding passages can be recalled at will. What hours, even years, of devoted labour the achievement must have cost a foreigner! He has also written largely⁵ on the subject which has held his affections for so long, and to him, more than to any other man, is due the rehabilitation of Newman, in spite of his personal history and the characteristic unconventionality of his thought, as a religious thinker on thoroughly orthodox lines. But among the many products of his pen none is of such importance and of such interest as the work, the name of which stands at the head of this article.

⁵ Especially we may mention Ringen der Gegenwart, *Religions begründung* and numerous articles.

We may profitably consider the magnitude of the task that lies before anyone who is ambitious of being in a position to speak with authority about Newman, and its complexity. The Uniform Edition of his works embraces close on forty volumes. Mr. Birrell casually under-estimates the number, when he puts them at between twenty and thirty volumes—but he disarms criticism by his charming remark that “they are happily numerous.” Furthermore, as Mr. Wilfrid Ward’s monumental biography covers only the Catholic life, it must of necessity be supplemented by Miss Mozley’s *Letters and Correspondence*,⁶ and the four volumes that go to form these two considerable works comprise more than two thousand pages. In addition there are in existence a very large number of unpublished letters, although the cream of these collections has already been skimmed. So much for the magnitude of the task. Its complexity is no less formidable. Newman was no abstract thinker, spinning theories in the solitude of his study, aloof from the age in which he lived, and unconscious of the problems that seared the minds of his contemporaries and wrung their hearts. On the contrary, he was a religious leader first and always, with his finger ever on the pulse of events and his whole being sensitive to the changing currents of thought and opinion, and an author only because his mission in life seemed to impose authorship upon him as a necessary condition of the victory of the cause he championed. He did not possess the literary temperament capable of self-expression for its own sake; he was at his best only when some challenge or other summoned him into the field, and circumstances forced him to compose at fever-heat. The *Apologia* cost him only a few weeks’ labour; the *Grammar of Assent* took years to mature. He realized this characteristic of his psychological make-up himself, and, speaking of himself in the third person, admits that “the Volumes which he has published have grown for the most part out of the duties which lay upon him, or out of the circumstances of the moment,”⁷ and that

⁶ This, too, ought to be supplemented by the *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others*, which covers the crucial years 1839-1845.

⁷ His books are mainly what the French call *livres de circonstance*. Mark Pattison observes (*Essays* II, 266) that “the works of our divines have been too occasional,” and Newman remarks (*Ward* II., 44) that this is characteristic of English literature generally.

he has taken up his pen at intervals, and on accidental, not to say sudden, opportunities." Hence he cannot be understood, as he ought to be understood, without an intimate knowledge, on the part of the reader, of the times which formed, as it were, the setting of his life. The religious movement, known as Evangelicism, for example, played an important part in his early life, and has left its mark, mainly by way of reaction, on the *Parochial Sermons*, but its significance in the understanding and interpretation of the Anglican Newman may easily be missed by those to whom Evangelicism is merely a name for a movement even then almost moribund. This intimate knowledge of nineteenth century England was on the whole lacking in his earlier French interpreters, who went astray largely because they dealt with him, as if they were attacking an abstract problem in pure mathematics. One of Przywara's great merits is that he does possess this intimate knowledge, and that he has read and studied Newman with his eye focussed on the historical context.

But if the task is so formidable, how stands the ordinary reader, the average man, or whatever else he may be termed, in regard to it? It may fairly be claimed that we have a vast inheritance, but hitherto no inventory of our treasures; they are given us in profusion, but they ought to be sorted, catalogued, harmonised.⁸ Years ago Father Vincent McNabb wrote: "Of all the syntheses of modern thought left us by the nineteenth century, it may well be asked if Newman's is not the most thorough and true, though not the most minute. Kant, Hegel, Comte, Darwin, Spencer have left generalisations of greater minuteness than the *Grammar of Assent* or the *Essay on Development*. But the student of pure valid thinking must come back to Littlemore and Edgbaston at last, if only for inspiration." Yet there are the thirty-six volumes and the multitudinous accessory material! It is possible, of course, to concentrate attention on what Newman terms his five constructive works—the *Prophetic Office*, *Justification*, the *Essay on Development*, the *Discourses on University Education*, and the *Grammar of Assent*. But even if they are studied in their entirety, how great the lacuna, for their author scattered his prin-

⁸ This is what Newman says in *Via Media* I, 24, about the condition of Anglican theology at the time of the movement.

ciples broadcast through his works, and passages essential for the synthetic view are to be found in the most unlikely places. The way of selection lies open, and it is really the only way. Tabloid anthologies, in spite of their disadvantages, may claim to be justified, if they assemble a writer's scattered utterances and make them converge upon a single centre. Lilly's well-known *Characteristics*, to choose an obvious example, is useless for our purpose, because it is not compiled on any definite principle, and its range is far too wide. Newman's "ultimate judgments on the most important matters of which he has written," as Lilly calls them, may possess a certain interest for Newman's admirers; but presented as they are, they remind the reader of the Indian rope-trick, in which the rope has no apparent means of support. But Przywara, although he pursues the way of selection, has chosen a better path; in fact, he has cut his path on scientific principles, and reaches a goal that is well worth achieving.

Towards the close of his little monograph on Newman—still the best study that has yet appeared in English—R. H. Hutton remarks that no life of the last century can compare with his in unity of meaning and constancy of purpose. The unity of meaning issued from the constancy of purpose, and what that purpose was Newman explained in his Biglietto speech on his elevation to the Cardinalate—opposition to the spirit of liberalism in religion, which was equivalent to a denial of the truth of any religion. The maintenance of dogmatic Christianity in the world and the promotion of the spiritual life in the individual give the keynote of his life. His greatness, writes Mr. Wilfrid Ward, "lay in the passionate concentration of extraordinary and varied gifts on one great enterprise. His overmastering desire was to secure the influence of Christian faith in an age in which Christianity appeared to him threatened with complete overthrow. All his work in the pulpit, in history, in philosophy, in theology, in apologetics, was devoted solely to the cause of reviving and preserving the influence of the Christian religion for the age to come. To make the many earnest Christians was the work of a preacher. The truth of Christianity inevitably raised questions of historical fact, and of the philosophy of history, and of theology. And the rising philosophy of scepticism called for a rival philosophy of faith suitable for the times. He

did not touch history or theology for their own sake, but solely as bearing on his great aim. And he did not care to pursue them into regions which had no connection therewith."⁹ Such Newman was, and as such he must primarily be judged—as an apologist for Christianity. His personal vocation cost the world dear in other respects; it is sad to contemplate the loss to learning involved in his self-dedication; and Swinburne even paused to deplore the fact that perhaps a true poetic force had been "spilt on the sands or lost in the thickets" of theology. But such regrets are vain, for it is a condition of human life that we cannot develop all our capacities to their utmost. Progress along one line seems always to involve stagnation or retrogression along another. But even as an apologist, Newman seemed to suffer from curious hesitations. At one time and over a considerable period, he thought of writing a great work on Apologetics to be prefixed to his suggested English version of the Bible. The suggestion proved abortive, not through his own fault, and he broke off his draft in the middle of a sentence with the note: "This is but the beginning of a large work which is to go on to defend the Church and its position in the world in the nineteenth century as confronted with, and as against the penetrating knowledge, learning and ability of the scientific men and philosophers of the day."

It is in these aspects, firstly as a Christian apologist, and secondly as a spiritual guide, that Przywara regards Newman, and rightly so, because they are fundamental. But his English publishers tend to exaggerate when they claim that his "whole range of teaching" is exhibited here. Much of his teaching is necessarily omitted, the theory of development, for example, and the theory of certitude,¹⁰ because it did not fall immediately within the scope of the work. The former Przywara dismisses with a quotation from Pesch, which deserves to be reproduced, to the effect that Newman might well have had St. Thomas Aquinas in front of him when he was writing the Essay on Development. But taking it for what Przywara professes it to be, the work is remarkably complete. In the German original it appeared under the title *Christentum*, and to the limitations implied in the title the

⁹ Last Lectures, p. 10.

¹⁰ Przywara deals with this in the *Einführung*.

author¹¹ has scrupulously adhered. Made up of eight small volumes, of which the last four are bound into two, it falls into two main parts, the first, *The Path to Christianity*, comprising the first three volumes, and the second, *The Path in Christianity*, the last four. Between the two parts there is interjected a volume entitled *Einführung in Newman Wesen und Werk*, which is intended to serve as an introduction to the whole series. It contains three chapters: 1. Newman's Soul. 2. Newman's Fundamental Ideas. 3. Newman's Work. Though compressed to such a degree (it contains only 112 pages) as to be almost unintelligible to the average reader and demanding, for its full understanding, an equipment of knowledge possessed only by the philosopher and the theologian, it will undoubtedly appeal to those qualified to judge, as the most exact and the most comprehensive contribution to the study of Newman hitherto made. In style and form it resembles the famous guide-books that pass under the name of Baedeker, but none the less it is indispensable to everyone who wishes to grasp Newman's thought in its totality, inasmuch it offers a clue to the labyrinth and determines the path that must be pursued. Though it may be granted that publishers know their own business best, yet the omission of this invaluable introduction does seem at first sight unfortunate; but it would appear that English readers are not to remain permanently at a disadvantage as compared with the author's countrymen, since an English translation is in course of preparation and will be published after no long interval of time.

But since it has not yet been published, it may be well to set forth here the basic principles on which Przywara has proceeded in his interpretation of Newman, and which form the framework of his little volume. The method he has adopted is the obvious one in the case of a thinker who has been as much misunderstood as Newman has been: having removed the misunderstandings of which he has been the centre, he proceeds to an exposition of his fundamental ideas—an exposition which gradually projects a conception of Newman's system as a synthetic whole—and finally he presents this system in

¹¹ The German original bears the names of two authors, but as the second was responsible only for the translations, his name has naturally been omitted in the English version.

outline. The methodological principles, the application of which effects the removal of the misunderstandings, are four in number, and may be expressed in the following terms :

1. The line of development in Newman's thought should be determined, and the last solution of each problem adopted as decisive.

2. His different polemical positions should be defined, and the result applied as the deciding factor between apparently opposing solutions.

3. His specific philosophy and theology should be elucidated, and his terminology settled.

4. The religious type to which he may be assigned should be delineated.

In the third chapter (pp. 97-107) of his *Einführung* Przywara gives in outline the positive system that results from the application of these principles. This chapter is indispensable inasmuch as it exhibits in its gaunt nudity the skeleton, as it were, that imposes unity upon the chaos of selections, and binds them together in such a way that they form an organic whole. The fundamental idea of the system, as presented by Przywara, both at the apologetic stage and at the ascetic, is that Christianity is the counterpart of nature, i.e. fallen nature, for in Newman nature is usually nature as disfigured by the fall of man, and hence a religion of redemption, which ultimately restores man to his original condition forfeited by him through the fall. The path of fallen man to Christianity leads him through three stages, denominated respectively Advent, the Fullness of Time, Faith, which provide the titles of the first three volumes (§§ I-VIII in the English edition). He begins with a consideration of his actual condition as one of sin and misery; passes on to a consideration of Christ as his Saviour, divinely willed and divinely commissioned, and of the Church as His kingdom; and reaches the goal in the acceptance, dictated by faith, of Christ as what He claims to be, and of the Church as what He declared it to be, and in an ever-growing conviction, fostered by the life of faith, that Christ and Christianity give him assurance of redemption, and will finally restore him to the *status integritatis* lost through the fault of our first parents.

In the first stage there are two sub-stages : i. the appre-

hension by conscience of God as the upholder of the moral law, and as the infinitely holy judge; and ii. the perception of his own condition as full of sin and misery, and of his utter need of God's guidance and help. At the end of the first sub-stage fallen man realizes himself, although a mere nothing before God's incomprehensibility and infinity, to be nevertheless a being dependent upon Him and significant through Him; and at the end of the second he is ready, in obedience to the voice of conscience, to anticipate a revelation; crushed by the recognition of his sinfulness and helplessness, he longs and looks out for divine help, to which he can, through his own guilt and unworthiness, establish no claim; and he is inclined, if God should offer Himself, to submit to His guidance, however dark and impassable the road marked out for him appears to be.

Thus he is prepared and disposed to enter upon the second stage, in which he contemplates Christ as the Messiah sent by God, and therefore of necessity accredited through the miracles that marked His earthly life, as a Messiah whose power endures until the end of time, as the Messiah, upon whom the old and the new covenants are established so as to constitute the one great economy of salvation, as the Messiah who lives on in His Church, infallible at once and indefectible.

When these two stages have been traversed—the first being one of preparation generating in the mind an anticipation, a presumption, an antecedent probability of the truth of Christianity, and a disposition to accept it, and the second one of verification in which evidences, facts, instances, are present to the mind, comes the third stage. This is, as it were, the logical conclusion to which the premises lead, the major being the disposition to believe produced in the first stage, the minor the obligation to believe induced in the second, and the conclusion the act of faith, which is not the necessary result of a process of reasoning, inasmuch as it is, in the last analysis, an act of the will, and the will is free either to accept or to reject. The surrender of reason, involved in the act of faith, opens the door to the life of faith, and the life of faith, on its intellectual side, resolves itself into a process of "realizing"¹² the contents of revelation, the consum-

¹² Mark Pattison (*Essays* II., 303) mentions that "Newman's constant effort was to 'realize' the doctrines of the Church; it was his favourite word at one time."

mation of which is "wisdom," i.e. "a habit or faculty of mind distinct from Faith, the mature fruit of Reason, and nearly answering to what is meant by Philosophy."¹³ But however far this process is continued, "wisdom" has its divinely-appointed limits, and falls short of vision, abiding in *umbris et imaginibus*, until the veils are removed. Finally, to the man who has attained maturity in wisdom Christianity appears in its unity as the restitution of all things lost through the fall, Christianity is nothing but the One Christ, and we His members, growing in Him to the fulness of heaven, and in the One Christ God revealed as "strength in weakness, God in flesh, life in death," and God shining "in the countenance of Jesus Christ whose body is the Church," now in faith recognised as the undreamed-of fulfilment of that presentiment of His majesty awakened by the voice of conscience, restored unity in the one God, the beginning and end of the path meeting in Him, who is alpha and omega, the first and the last.

Such in brief is the analysis of the system that Przywara thinks he has found in Newman. He employs it as a framework to give coherence to the selections he has chosen from some two dozen volumes of his. The successive points in the analysis are repeated, and developed at greater length, in the analytical summaries that connect the various sections with one another. In passing judgment, it should never be forgotten that Newman did not formulate a system, and that in consequence an attempt to supply the want from his works must inevitably be a hazardous venture. Przywara himself would seem to be on the verge of admitting this, when he describes Newman as synthetic rather than analytic, as an intuitionist not a grammarian, an artistic not a logical philosopher, and ascribes to him the strength of a germ as a germ, counterbalanced by its inherent weakness as an undeveloped germ. But it is pertinent to ask whether the edifice which he has raised corresponds at all points, without addition or subtraction, to that which Newman would have conceived, had he set his mind to the task. That is a question easy enough to put, but almost impossible to answer. Probably Newman would have expressed a mild surprise, if he had seen the fragments he had left without a plan fitted together and

¹³ University Sermons, p. 281.

arranged to form so magnificent a structure. But are we in a position to say that Przywara represents the real Newman? Critics have a way of interrogating, as it were, the authors in whom they are interested upon subjects they never contemplated, and finding their answers to questions they never raised. All we can venture to reply is that Przywara puts the reader on the right track. He may occasionally read more into Newman than he actually said, even more than can be strictly justified, but, if we may adopt a favourite Tractarian word, the *ethos* of his work is sound. Certainly he elucidates the main features of Newman's apologetic, and that is an achievement for which we owe him a considerable debt of gratitude; and even if his structure should appear to an acute observer here and there to have its weak points, nevertheless the material he has so diligently quarried will still retain its value, for Newman can never cease to be a source of inspiration to all future generations.

If a criticism may be passed on one of the main points in Przywara's exposition, it is this, that at the time when he wrote his *Einführung*, and compiled his selections, he had not realized precisely the particular point of view from which Newman envisaged the problems that haunted his mind for many years. In claiming Newman as an immanentist the French writers went wrong, just because they had failed to grasp what he was driving at; it redounds to Przywara's credit that, with the same evidence before him, he succeeded in avoiding the same pitfall. The problem, in the context which it assumed in Newman's mind, may be stated in his own words taken from a paper, unfinished and unpublished, belonging to the year 1860: "If religion is consequent upon *reason* and at the same time for *all* men, there must be reasons producible sufficient for the rational conviction of every individual." In the same paper he remarks that this was the subject of which he had treated in his Oxford University Sermons, but that he would attempt to speak with greater distinctness than before, because he had in the past been feeling his way without being able to find it, and through his consciousness of this he had not the requisite confidence in his own train of thought. When this paper was brought to Przywara's notice he wrote the essay on *J. H. Newman's Problemstellung*, which is included in *Ringten der Gegenwart*, and which ought to be read as a supplement to the *Einführung*.

The answer to the question, why this particular subject should have imposed itself upon Newman's attention, lies on the surface of the religious philosophy of his time. In the *Church of the Fathers*¹⁴ he incidentally gives the answer himself in reference to St. Anthony: "He considered, contrariwise to present notions, that the *consciousness* was no necessary *condition* of being rational. I mean, it is the present opinion that no one can be acting according to reason, unless he reflects on himself and recognises his own rationality. A peasant, who cannot tell *why* he believes, is supposed to have no reason for believing. This is worth noticing, for it is parallel to many other dogmas into which a civilized age will be sure to fall." The allusion here is to what is known as the Evidential School,¹⁵ which assumed that "a man's religious belief is a result which issues at the end of an intellectual process"—a process entirely concerned with the *Evidences*, i.e. the historical proofs of religion. This school of thought developed an Old Bailey type of theology, "in which . . . the Apostles [were] tried once a week for the capital crime of forgery."¹⁶ That this is not an exaggeration, is shown by the fact that a popular manual of the eighteenth century, Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, represents the Apostles as arraigned for giving false evidence about the Resurrection, and at the end acquitted by the jury. Newman complains that Locke's philosophy, which contributed not a little to the peculiar development of theological thought in the following century, "cut off from the possibility and the privilege of faith all but the educated few."¹⁷ Groping his way towards a solution of the difficulty, he maintained that, "if children, if the poor, if the busy, can have true Faith, yet cannot weigh evidence, evidence is not the simple foundation on which Faith is built."¹⁸ The attempt to do justice to the solution which he ultimately reached would occupy too much space; but if we are in a position to grasp the nature of the difficulty with which he was grappling, we have advanced a long way towards the

¹⁴ Ch. xix.

¹⁵ Mark Pattison's Essay, *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England*, in his *Essays*, Vol. II.

¹⁶ Pattison, p. 49.

¹⁷ Development, p. 328.

¹⁸ University Sermons, p. 231.

understanding of much of what he wrote, and we shall certainly see that many of the criticisms levelled against his teaching are entirely wide of the mark.

To sum up in a few words, his thesis was that a distinction must be drawn between the scientific proofs of Christianity and the *motiva credibilitatis* of the individual, although the latter are concurrent with and included under the former, and that the personal *motiva credibilitatis* will ultimately be found to rest upon a rational basis of some kind. It was this subject, too, that forced him to write the *Grammar of Assent*, although in that work he took a wider sweep, and discussed the concrete thought of the concrete man, or what R. H. Hutton called, "that fine and intricate region which connects the logic of facts with the logic of the understanding."¹⁹

In this article considerable space has been devoted to Newman's apologetic, because in recent years it has focussed attention, and provoked discussion, and it seemed that a danger-signal might save readers from following an *ignis fatuus* into the morass of unprofitable criticism. But the ascetic portion of the volume also calls for a few comments. The most striking fact about it is that an ascetic work, intended for Catholics, should have been compiled mainly from Newman's Anglican writings. That this was necessarily so, is to be ascribed to a certain delicacy of feeling on his part. His conversion wrought a complete change, as he explained in the Advertisement prefixed to his *Occasional Sermons*, in his attitude towards what he had hitherto regarded as his personal mission in life. It appeared to him "incongruous that one, who had so freely taught and published error in a Protestant communion, should put himself forward as a dogmatic teacher in the Catholic Church," although he contemplated writing on philosophy and ecclesiastical history, and did not exclude religious controversy, criticism, and literature. Granted this attitude, it is easy to understand why he refrained, as a Catholic, from editing his Anglican Sermons which, in consequence, do not contain corrections and notes similar to those added to his other writings edited by himself. In these circumstances it is inevitable that there should occur phrases and expressions, that he would not have used as a Catholic, and would most certainly have been removed if he

¹⁹ Contemporary Thought and Thinkers, II, 274.

had taken upon himself the editorship. But in general the impression conveyed by these Sermons is that the preacher tends to make the heights of Mount Carmel unduly difficult of access to the aspirant. This in part results from a fundamental feature of Tractarian teaching which, as long as it remained without the counterpoise of specifically Catholic doctrine, conduced to an excess of austerity both in theory and practice. "The desire of holiness," writes Professor Webb in his little book on the Oxford Movement, "was its grand inspiration from first to last; and this is the central truth about it."²⁰ In fact it was in a sense the application to practical life of the lesson learnt from Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, "holiness rather than peace," which had become almost proverbial on Newman's lips. But it was not so much peculiar to Newman as characteristic of the Movement as a whole. Herein lies the secret of the intense, sometimes oppressive, seriousness of the leaders, and their sense, apparent in all their spiritual writings, of the utter, unrelieved, horror of sin. To Newman, in particular, sin bore with it the note of irrevocability almost, and that for three reasons, which show that, however far he had advanced, he had not yet risen to the full measure of Catholic belief: 1. In the case of sin committed with full deliberation he drew no distinction between mortal and venial. 2. In the case of post-baptismal sin he did not recognise any covenanted means of remission, such as are provided in the Sacrament of Penance. 3. He did not believe that the souls of the just would attain to the beatific vision before the last judgment. Perhaps the attentive reader, with mind on the alert for gaps or omissions, will observe that distinctively Catholic, even Tractarian, doctrines and practices do not appear prominently in the Sermons. Such omissions were deliberate: he purposely kept out of sight in the pulpit all controversial topics, especially the tenets peculiar to the party, and confined himself to the commonplaces of Christianity, which he lifted out of the commonplace by his singular gift of making his hearers, through the clarity and force of his language, sensitive to the sheer actuality of the invisible world as compared with the instability, almost the unreality, of human life and all human things.

But when everything has been said, all criticisms

²⁰ P. 53.

passed, all warnings given, it remains true at the last, as at the first, that Przywara, having taken upon himself a task such as no Englishman has yet attempted, has carried it through with the most consummate skill to a successful issue. For those who do not know Newman, he has provided a foretaste of what they will find in his many volumes, if they are led on to read them; to those to whom his works are through long habit familiar he has given an anthology, drawn up on an intelligible and coherent plan, of many noble and lovely passages, known to them but none the less welcome, in which the things of the spirit are handled with the exquisite grace and poignant delicacy that alone befit them, and with the propriety that marks the master of the spiritual life, who is also a master of languages.

JESUS AND LIFE*

By DR. KARL ADAM, Professor in the Catholic Faculty
of the University of Tübingen.

THE glory of His Father, the fulfilment of His Divine Will, the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven : such were the aims of our Lord's human life. By the side of this divine purpose and pursuit of the "one thing necessary," there was no room for any ideal of a purely earthly character. "He that hateth not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Lk. xiv. 26; Mt. x. 37).

Indeed, it would almost seem that Jesus was so aflame with zeal for the glory of His heavenly Father that He disregarded and despised all earthly values and rejected that earthly life which is compacted of them; or, at least, that He regarded this earthly life and its interests as something in itself quite indifferent, and as related to the Kingdom of Heaven only in a loose sense, as being the training ground and battlefield of God's soldiers. So we may fairly ask what was in fact the outlook of our Lord's human mind, and what was its natural tendency. Was He one of those mystics who in the fierce effort of their Godward ascent strive to put away from them all earthly desire and look upon this world as a prison or as a place of exile? What was His attitude towards the life of the peaceful hill-country of Galilee, or of the turbulent streets of Jerusalem, as that life flowed round Him in gladness and in sorrow, in pleasure and pride and power? Did He flee from that life—or did He accept and master it?

There is no feature in their delineation of Jesus which the Evangelists bring out so plainly and powerfully as His passionate devotion to His Heavenly Father, His unconditional surrender of His whole being to the Divine Will: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me" (Jn. iv. 34). But for Jesus this Father was not the pale and distant deity of contemporary Hellenistic philosophy,

* This is the first chapter of Dr. Adam's *Christus unser Bruder* (*Christ our Brother*) translated by Dom Justin McCann. It is printed here by kind permission of Messrs. Sheed & Ward, who are publishing the complete work immediately.

or of that late Jewish theology which was so much influenced by it. He was no remote God, sitting enthroned above the clouds in solitary silence and maintaining contact with men only through His angelic hosts; He was the living God of revelation. Here our Lord's teaching is linked up with the pure preaching of the prophets, wherein God was set forth emphatically as the most living and most personal presence and power. Jesus regarded His Father as one who is ever active (*Cf.* Jn. v. 19) and constantly working (Jn. ix. 4). It is He that sends sun and rain (Mt. v. 45). He clothes the lilies of the field (Mt. vi. 30) and feeds the ravens (Lk. xii. 24). No single sparrow falls to the ground without the Father (Mt. x. 29), and all the hairs of our heads are numbered in His reckoning (Mt. x. 30). The qualities and talents of a man, his "pound," are from God, and God will demand back that which is His own (Mt. xxv. 27). Our daily bread is the gift of our Father. Man belongs to God as the sheep belongs to its shepherd and master (Lk. xv. 6), and depends on him for his very being and his every act. And so too the destiny of man and of the world is determined by the Will of God. All depends upon Him, the whole course of this world's history, with its wars and tribulations, to the very end (Mk. xiii. 32). From Him come the leaders of mankind; the prophets (Mt. xxiii. 24, 37) and John the Baptist were sent by Him (Mt. x. 10; Jn. i. 6). Above all, from Him comes the Son.

That was what God meant to Jesus, and with such a faith how could He give any but a secondary place to creaturely causality? Neither the rigid course of natural law, nor any human energy, could be regarded by Him as ultimate realities. In all existence, in all activity, in every happening He pierced to the ultimate fact and saw the finger of God. For Him there was absolutely nothing on earth which was not completely controlled by the Divine Will. For Him every single fact was an embodiment and incarnation of the Will of God.

That being so, His attitude towards life and towards its living values could only be a positive and affirmative attitude, and indeed a profoundly religious attitude. For to Him reality was not the operation of some cold external necessity, or soulless and inexorable destiny, but a manifestation of mind and absolute freedom and perfect goodness, the work of His Father's Will. For Jesus there was

no such thing as "dead" nature. In mountain and stream, in flower and in bird, and above all in God's favourite, man, Jesus, with His soul immersed in God, recognised and hailed that same reality, the most living, the most profound, the most precious thing of all that He knew. And so His contact with the actual world was a contact with the Will of His Father, and an immediate experience of the Wisdom, Goodness and Beauty of God. It was devotion, prayer, religion.

Hence came that love of nature which in its expression is so realistic, so devoted and so profound, as to ring completely modern. His parables, with their masterly delineation of the simple and the unnoticed, belong in their effortless sublimity to the greatest things of human literature. At one time He is rejoicing in the birds of the air, that sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns. At another He is watching children playing in an Eastern street, and they pipe, and dance, and sing, and some of them sulk. Now He is thinking of the gladness of the young mother, who forgets all her pain in the joy of her new-born son. Again He sees the poor woman who has lost her goat: she lights a candle, and sweeps her house and seeks diligently until she finds it. Nothing is too small for Him. He takes the tiniest flower of the roadside, and lifts it lovingly up and up, like some divine forget-me-not, and makes it speak with a thousand tongues of God and of His loving care. Nor was His love for nature and natural things any merely sentimental enthusiasm such as was characteristic of the poets of the Romantic Movement. Of the love of nature for nature's sake Jesus knew nothing. For Him nature was nothing more and nothing less than a living manifestation of the Will of God; and, in consequence, His love of nature was only one expression of His love for God and God's Will. But just for that very reason was His love of nature so genuine and so whole-hearted.

And if Jesus loved nature, He loved man more wholeheartedly still. Man's being was so pervaded by the Will of His Father and so bound up with it, that it was impossible to love God without loving man also. The Old Testament set down separately the two commandments: Thou shalt love God, Thou shalt love thy neighbour. Jesus ran the two into one: "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do

ye also to them. For this is the law and the prophets." (Mt. vii. 12). Love of our fellow man is but another aspect of our love of God. And just as our Lord could not love nature for nature's sake, even so His love of man was no love of man apart from God. He loved man because God loved him. It was this high quality, as Nietzsche recognised, which gave His love its wholesome balance and its delicate refinement. And the same quality of His love made it something so utterly genuine, personal and delicate, as genuine and as deep as His love for His Father. "And he took a little child, and sat him in the midst of them; and taking him in his arms, he said unto them....." (Mk. ix. 35). How well He understood the grace of sympathy! He could make His own the anguish of a father's heart (Cf. Mk. v. 36), the hopeless sorrow of a desolate mother (Lk. vii. 13), the distress of an invalid (Mt. ix. 2). See how He dealt with the woman taken in adultery, with repentant Peter, with the Good Thief. Is there anywhere else in the whole Gospel such sweet gentleness and such charming delicacy, both in what He says and in what He does not say?

And how His soul was touched when He encountered human pain! The Gospels tell us over and over again that He had compassion on the multitude (Mt. ix. 36; xiv. 14; xv. 32; Mk. i. 41; Lk. vii. 13). It was characteristic of Him and it had deeply impressed His disciples. Jesus many times rejected the petitions of strangers (Lk. xii. 14; Mk. v. 19); but never an appeal for help in need. "And he healed them all" (Cf. Mk. vi. 56; Lk. v. 17, etc.). Not seldom He did not wait to be asked (Mk. i. 25; iii. 3; v. 8; x. 5, etc.). He preferred to break the Sabbath and scandalize the Pharisees rather than refuse help (Mk. i. 23; iii. 2; Lk. xiii. 14; xiv. 3; Jn. v. 9; ix. 14). He could not endure to see misery. He could not eat His bread in the Pharisee's house until He had healed the sick man who was present there (Lk. xiv. 2). And see how He spoke to those in pain, addressing them in the simplest and tenderest words: "Son," says He to the man sick of the palsy (Mk. ii. 5); "Daughter" to the poor woman with the issue of blood (Mk. v. 34). And when He sounded the very depth of human wretchedness, as at the grave of Lazarus or before the doomed city of Jerusalem, then, the Gospel tells us, He "groaned in spirit and was troubled" (Jn. xi. 33), and "seeing the city, He wept over it" (Lk. xix. 41). Indeed His

life and His miracles are a history of love breaking victoriously through the greatest obstacles. And so completely did He identify Himself with love, that He could declare that we do to Him whatever we do to the least of His brethren.

How different Jesus is in this respect from the stern figure of St. John the Baptist, as the Gospel brings him before us, from whom we hear little of love, but much of penance. And it is possible for us to push asceticism so far, that we lose all feeling and sympathy for others. But Jesus did not yield to this tendency. He left the wilderness and went among men. He had an eye not only for the wickedness and sin of the world, but also for its suffering. And with all its wealth and breadth of sympathy His heart went out to man and to his suffering.

And it went out also to his joy. And this indeed is a fact which throws the clearest and plainest light upon Our Lord's manner of regarding life. The creed of the Stoic Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, was "Sustain and abstain." To the Neo-Platonists the body was the soul's prison, and death an escape. To the ancient Egyptian solitary his duty seemed comprised in the terse command: "Flee, be silent, weep." And in the time of Jesus the would-be "righteous" and "separate" Pharisees had similar views of life. Following the "traditions of the ancients" (Mt. xv. 2ff; Mk. vii. 3ff), they had added to the five great national fasts by appointing weekly fasts on Mondays and Thursdays, and by their severe rules for fasting they had cramped all joy. And the Gospel tells us that St. John the Baptist and his disciples fasted strictly. But Jesus of set purpose and deliberate intent rejected the requirements of this code (Cf. Mt. xi. 18; Lk. vii. 33, 34). It was not fasting itself that He rejected—for He had Himself fasted forty days in the wilderness—but the dispositions in which these fasts were practised. The Jews kept fasts in memory of grievous national calamities, and indulged themselves in sadness and despondency. Jesus censured such dismal fasting. "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head" (Mt. vi. 17). He estimated the value and worth of fasting, as of all other devotional exercises, according to the intention of the heart. He would have it done in gladness of heart with a pure and joyful acceptance of God and of His fatherly Will.

When fasting depresses and paralyses the soul, then it no longer does it any good. And His disciples, the "friends of the bridegroom," do not fast "so long as the bridegroom is with them" (Mt. ix. 14). So our Lord's rejection of the mortifications of the Pharisees was a deliberate rejection of that dismal, cramped and violent asceticism and a decisive adoption of a freer and gladder attitude. "Have you not read what David did when he was hungry, and they that were with him: how he entered into the house of God and did eat the loaves of proposition"? And should the children of the household be forbidden to take that which their Father offers them? (Mt. xii. 4). So Jesus too took His share unaffectedly and without embarrassment in the little joys that day brought after day. He suffered Himself to be invited and He went to dinner, even though His enemies in their malice would call Him therefore a "glutton and a wine-bibber" (Mt. xi. 19). Banquets were given in His honour, whether by Levi (Lk. v. 29) or another Pharisee (Lk. vii. 36; Mk. xiv. 3; Lk. xi. 37; xiv. 1). At another time He was in the intimate family circle of Simon and his wife's mother (Lk. xix. 6), or with the busy Martha (Lk. x. 38; Jn. xii. 2), or He invited Himself to the table of Zacchæus (Lk. xix. 6). He worked His first miracle for the guests of a marriage feast (Jn. ii. 10), and it is significant that He frequently found the framework and material for His parables in the happy banquet (Lk. xv. 22; xii. 19; xiii. 26; Mt. viii. 11) and the sumptuous marriage feast (Mt. xxii. 11; ix. 15; xxv. 1; Lk. xii. 36). He envisaged the glory of eternity itself as a sitting down to table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Mt. viii. 11). And His final and greatest gift to His disciples before His death was a love feast, the feast of everlasting communion in His Body and Blood.

Away then with Nietzsche's supposition, that Jesus never laughed. How is it possible that He should not Himself have known a deep and pure joy, who was preaching the glad gospel of the Father, and who in all joy and in all sorrow recognised God's infinite power and goodness? Jesus loved men and loved their life in the Will of His Father. He was drawn to man not merely by His tears, but by His laughter also.

And again it was through His Father's Will that Jesus came profoundly into touch with the darker side of our

humanity, its folly and sin, its pettiness and misery. There was no eye so keen as His for the wretchedness of poor humanity. "If you then being evil" (Mt. vii. 11). "O generation of vipers, how can you speak good things whereas you are evil?" (Mt. xii. 38). "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign" (Mt. xii. 39). We seem to hear in these words an undertone of a deep, secret antipathy towards this depraved and distorted humanity. And yet He knew that even this poor humanity was not without some sort of inward relation to the Will of His Father. And therefore could He "suffer" it yet further. And His soul was attuned to the sublime melody of unwearied patience with the miseries of men. The cockle must not be torn up, but must be let grow, even to the day of God's harvesting. We must not call down fire from heaven upon the unbelieving cities. The Father sendeth His sunshine and His rain upon just and unjust alike. And since everything depends on the Father, therefore "Judge not!" We cannot here and now, in this world, separate the "Just" and the "Sinners." The son of Abraham, even if he be a priest or levite, is not always better than the Samaritan. Abiding again by the Will of His Father, Jesus rose majestically superior to all the perversities of human civilisation, to all moral, social and national distinctions and divisions. And He stood also outside all economic and political conflicts. He would have nothing to do with questions of inheritance (Lk. xii. 14). We must give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's (Mt. xxii. 21). "Peter, put up thy sword into its place" (Mt. xxvi. 52).

What then was His attitude towards life? There was in Him no world-weariness, no strengthless melancholy, no timid shrinking from the fray. He looked reality full in the face, and gripped it with both His hands, and with His whole heart accepted it. There was no part of reality which He tried violently to explain away, or to shut His eyes to. Jesus was no dreamer. He was a realist, utterly alive to all the facts, to the full, complete reality, whether that reality were light or darkness. Nor was His devotion to natural things and to man any mere "love to order," any mere act of obedience to God which left His heart indifferent.

For the Will of God and natural things were not for Jesus two separate and disjointed factors, only conjoined

in a purely external manner. On the contrary the Will of God was manifested in things and through them. Therefore, in loving the Will of God, He was loving things also, in the very centre of their being. He felt Himself one with all reality, in a union that was formed and maintained by that living might of God's Will which was manifest in all.

But on the other hand, for the very reason that reality had no meaning for Him but as an expression of His Father's Will, His love for reality was subsumed by His love for His Father. His relation to reality was strictly dependent on His relation to His Father. And therefore He never surrendered Himself unreservedly to it. An earthly attraction which should conflict with the Will of His Father, such a thing could not touch the soul of Jesus. His life-zest was ennobled and transfigured by a marvellous steadiness of soul, a sure loftiness of sentiment and thought. His long fast in the wilderness, His vigils, the poverty of His wandering life, the labours of His preaching, His ministry to the poor and outcast, the maturity and distinction of His manner towards His malicious opponents, above all the heroism of His life and of His death—these things can be understood only if we realise that He was ever and in all circumstances the captain of His soul. He possessed Himself fully; He was not subject to the things amid which He lived; but living among them remained ever completely Himself.

Jesus did not flee from life, nor yet was He subject to life. Jesus mastered life.

ON FEASTS SIMPLE AND DOUBLE

By THE REV. BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN, O.C.D.

"TO-MORROW being a semi-double, I shall say a black Mass." Are there any priests who have not given this reply time after time to the inquiries of the sacristan laying out the vestments for next day's Mass? Yet not so very long ago (as centuries count in the life of the Church), a semi-double was a great feast, quite incompatible with a non-privileged Mass for the dead; for it was only the missal of Pope St. Pius V (1570) which made this concession. And the Pontifical committee charged with the revision of the missal (1920) had a mind to abolish it: *Mens fuit has missas excludendi Tempore Paschali et in festis semiduplicibus*.¹ For the time being the Committee abandoned this plan, but only for the time being. A new and very thorough revision of both Missal and Breviary is promised against the time when the revised Vulgate is published in its entirety, for then will not only all the Biblical texts be revised in conformity with the new Vulgate, but the Kalendar will be recast (probably a new systematisation of the rank of feasts will be introduced), some feasts will be abolished, others reduced in rank, or kindred feasts combined, besides many other opportune alterations.² At the rate the publication of the Vulgate is proceeding it is unlikely that either the present writer or the majority of his readers will ever have a chance of using the promised new Breviary or Missal, and so it may be useful to say something about the present, rather confusing, system of "festival hierarchy."

For there *is* system, there are principles, but so overlaid with exceptions that they are hardly discoverable. The Missal of 1570 established the principle that Holy Women, possessing one "crown," Virginity or Martyrdom, had a semi-double feast, but those possessing both, a double feast. The feast of St. Cecilia would therefore be

¹ Aloysius Barin, *In novissimas rubricas missalis Romani Commentarium*. Rhodigii et Romæ, 1920, p. 219.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

double, that of St. Scholastica semi-double, as in fact it was for a hundred years or so. The first exception to the rule was made on the occasion of the canonisation of St. Teresa (1622), whose feast from the first was double, of course on account of her great importance as a leader in mystical theology; perhaps also as a founder or reformer of a Religious Order. On the other hand, St. Martina (January 30) should have been double, as she is described as a Virgin *and* Martyr, but as her feast really commemorates the dedication of a Roman basilica, it is only semi-double. The present paper has not the purpose of explaining the reason, feast by feast, of the particular rank enjoyed by them at the present time, but rather of explaining historically the different ranks themselves. Neither is its purpose to deal with the historicity or otherwise of the legends of the Saints. This would be an interesting and instructive study, but it lies outside our present purpose.

1. SUNDAYS AND FERIAL DAYS.

It is difficult for us to imagine a year without weeks. The Romans had no weeks. There were Kalends and Nones and Ides, the latter two events occurring somewhat irregularly on the fifth and seventh, and on the thirteenth or fifteenth day of the month respectively. The second half of the month had no subdivision, it varied in length from fifteen to eighteen days. At odd times there were feasts, frequently also, even many days in succession, games. But of our regular succession of Sundays, Mondays, etc., there was no idea. The nearest approach were the market days, every ninth day, when country people came into the city to buy and sell, but that only affected greengrocers and other small merchants.

From the time of Pompey the Great there were in Rome many thousands of Jews, originally all of them slaves; within a short time many or most of them managed to shift for themselves. They acted as old clothes men, and hawkers, and street scavengers, or cobblers, many set up a little shop as grocers, or the equivalent of tobacconists, some did, and not badly, some money changing, or even moneylending on a small scale, or something that nowadays would be called stock-broking. One couldn't cross a street without noticing some Jews, as they were easily

recognisable by their features. But once in every seven days, as regular as clockwork, there was not a Jew to be seen; their shops were closed, no street scavenging was done, no old clothes bargained for, no coins changed and no money lent or borrowed. The whole Jewish population seemed spirited away. Of course the Romans noticed it because it put them to inconvenience. On the next day the Jews re-appeared as if nothing had happened, and the social life continued as usual. The Romans called this *sabbatizare*, and though they thought it rather absurd they had to reckon with it.

What few pence the Jews made during their six working days had to keep them for seven days, themselves and their wives and children, and perhaps some blind old grandfather or grandmother. It required industrious and thrifty people to do this, and the Jews had both qualities. They might be despised and disliked and loathed, but they were also admired and perhaps a little envied on account of their pure morals and their lofty principles.

One fine day there arose in connection with the Jews another party, the Christians, and the two soon fell out with each other, which was not surprising as the Jews had a reputation for quarrelling. There were two chief grievances; one was that the Jews only recognised as belonging to their race those who could trace their ancestry to Abraham, whereas besides some Christians who possessed this qualification, many others, even the majority, were of "heathen" descent; it was not right to associate with these. The other was that they were not half strict enough about the Sabbath. Those who came of Jewish stock kept, indeed, the law of Moses, but in addition to the Sabbath they also kept the first day of the week in memory of the Resurrection of Christ. That meant that they had but five days for work and two days rest, and that in five days they had to provide for seven days. Few, indeed, were able to do that, with the result that especially those of "heathen" descent rested more strictly on the first than on the seventh day. The principal reason why the Jews in Palestine had delivered to the Roman authorities the founder of Christianity was precisely that he had overruled the pharisaic law about the Sabbath; and now His followers more and more disregarded the Sabbath, the most conspicuous Jewish institution!

Open enmity between the two denominations ensued. It is said that Nero's first idea of saddling the responsibility for the burning of Rome on the Jews was overruled by Poppæa Sabina, his wife, herself a Jewish proselyte, who caused the Christians to be charged with the crime. Notwithstanding this and all the following persecutions, the number of Christians steadily increased, whereas that of the Jews remained more or less stationary.

The result was that the Christian Sunday became as well known to the Romans as the Sabbath had been. This transfer of the day of rest from the seventh to the first day of the week took place gradually and more or less unintentionally in the course of the first century, probably not only in Rome but simultaneously in many other places where the situation was somewhat similar. By the end of the first century it was well nigh complete.

We have not to deal here with the development of the Mass, but with that of the Kalendar which finds fuller expression in the Office than in the Liturgy. It would be idle to search for anything like a settled order of psalms and lessons and prayers at the Christian assemblies previous to the Peace of the Church and the building of the great basilicas. Christians depended far too much on circumstances of the most varied nature to allow of anything *settled*. At best some customs may have sprung up. But with the building of the basilicas and the multiplication of the clergy of different ranks, and especially with the accounts received in Rome of the Egyptian monks a very elaborate ritual was introduced. Apart from the Liturgy proper, the Mass, practically the whole of Sunday was taken up with the singing of psalms and the chanting of lessons. The night office (nowadays called Matins) was longer even than the Sunday Matins before the reform of the Breviary by Pius X, consisting, not of eighteen, but of twenty-four psalms;³ then there

³ Suitbert Bæumer, *Geschichte des Breviers* (Frieberg i/B. 1895), p. 253. The five psalms (Ps. xxi.-xxv.) after the time of Gregory the Great given to Sunday Prime (and by Pius V distributed over the weekdays' Prime) probably belonged originally to Sunday Matins. Ps. xciv. or, before the introduction of Compline, Ps. iv., completes the number of twenty-four. That the disposition of the Divine Office in the Roman basilicas was not of indigenous growth but was imported from the East would be clear, even if we had no other proof, from the fact that it has never been ascribed to any individual Pope.

came Lauds,⁴ the day hours during which the whole of the 118th psalm was sung, and, in the later afternoon Vespers. At present no one assisting at the chant of the Divine Office in the choir chapel of St. Peter's, or the Lateran, or any of the other basilicas, would be able to follow the words unless he happened to know the Office practically by heart; but originally the singing must have been very much slower and sweeter, for the people flocked to the basilicas to hear it, they understood the words, and were greatly touched and consoled and edified by these services, as we know from many accounts. There were different ways of singing the psalms; sometimes they were sung alternately, verse by verse, by the two sides of the choir; on other occasions some solo voices sang the psalm, the choir breaking in from time to time with a refrain, as is done to this day in the psalm *Venite adoremus*; this was called antiphonal singing, and for a short time⁵ such antiphons were in almost general use; but with the natural tendency of alleviating the burden, the antiphons at a very early date came to be relegated to the end of the psalm. Still, as the psalm tune depended upon the mode of the antiphon, the opening words of the latter had to be sung at the beginning of the psalm. This custom was maintained in the private recitation, not rarely to the detriment of the grammatical structure.⁶ The third way of chanting the psalms was for one voice to intone the first half of each verse, and for the choir to answer with the second. This is now only to be found in the *Preces*, which have become a mere appendix to the psalmody, but originally were an integral part of it.

The old Roman office made provision on weekdays only for Matins, Lauds and Vespers. The reason is obvious: the clergy had something else to do on weekdays, and

⁴ The hymn *Æterne rerum conditor*, now at the end of Sunday Lauds during winter, is really meant for the hour of Gallicinium, between Lauds and Prime. After having spent an hour and a half or two hours in singing the night office it is hardly appropriate to say *Surgamus ergo strenue*, when, as a matter of fact, it is time to go to sleep again. The Roman office, previous to the tenth century, had no hymns at all.

⁵ Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d' Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Paris, 1907, I, 2312 sqq.

⁶ E.g., *Sanctorum velut; Hymnus omnibus; Ego dæmonium*. The new breviary has remedied most of these infelicitous examples.

could not, as on Sundays, spend practically half the night and the whole day in singing the office. When the clergy became very numerous, and especially when most of the basilicas had monasteries attached to them, all the other hours were sung on weekdays as well as on Sundays, the Sunday office being repeated on the weekdays almost without change.

2. FEASTS

Tertullian, in a chapter of striking force, says that for the heathen there is but one feast day in the course of the year, but for Christians one day in every seven.⁷ Every Sunday counts as a commemoration of the Resurrection of Our Lord. The early Christians did not trouble themselves very much about dates.⁸ Neither the actual date of the birth of Our Lord, nor the year and day of His Passion are on record. With regard to the latter we have, indeed, several theories, all of them fairly plausible, but nothing really certain. As to the Nativity the difficulty is even greater. Dionysius the Little, to whom we owe our present chronology, chose for the beginning of our era a year in which the 25th of December fell on a Sunday. It is, however, certain (from the date of the death of King Herod) that his calculation was erroneous, but as to whether by three, four, five, six or seven years, is uncertain. We know even less about the day and month. According to Duchesne, Dom Leclercq⁹ and others, the 25th of December (*octavo Kalendas Januarii*) depends on the Nativity of St. John Baptist (*octavo Kalendas Julii*). That there is a connection between these two dates seems certain, but as there is no evidence that the Nativity of St. John was celebrated earlier than Christmas, and as we do not know what considerations led to assign to St. John the date of 24th of June, other scholars are of opinion that the date of St. John depends on that of Christmas. Be that as it may, it is certain that as early as the middle of the fourth century Christmas was cele-

⁷ Tertullian, *Liber de Idololatria*, cap. xiv. in fine. Migne, P.L.I., 682.

⁸ The Romans laying great store by astrology carefully recorded on tomb stones not only the day and year of birth and death of their relatives, but even the hour; Christians, on the other hand, contented themselves ordinarily with the vaguest indications: *vixit plus minus XX annos*.

⁹ Cabrol, *Dictionn. l.c.* VII, 2171.

brated in Rome on the 25th of December, and that the Circumcision and the Name day of Our Lord, and also the feast of the Purification depend on that date, while, in the Middle Ages, the Conception of St. John Baptist was kept on the 24th of September, to agree with the 24th of June. In the Orient the Birth of Our Lord was celebrated from a very early date, on the 6th of January, but about the year 377 Syria accepted from Rome the feast of Christmas on the 25th of December, and Rome accepted from the East the solemnity of the 6th of January, the Theophania, identified with the Adoration of the Magi.¹⁰

The Easter cycle, comprising the Ascension and Pentecost, depended from the very first upon more or less accurate astronomical calculations. Every student of Church history knows something about the acrimonious disputes, arising again and again in different parts of the world, concerning the orthodox choice of the day.

The feast of the Assumption of Our Lady appears first in the Gallican churches on the 18th of January; in Rome it was fixed by the Emperor Maurice (A.D. 582-602) on the 15th of August,¹¹ we do not know why.

These feasts concern "Mysteries." In the course of centuries many more have been added to them, but with these we are not concerned now. It suffices to say that they were never developed according to a preconceived system, hence the bewildering mixture of dates.

There were other feasts, the anniversaries of martyrs. Of these we are well informed. We possess a document of the greatest importance which has become known under a variety of names: *Calendarium Bucherianum*, Chronograph of A.D. 354, Calendar of (Furius Dionysius) Filocalus, Liberian Catalogue of A.D. 336, but which is best described as *Feriale romanum*.¹² It contains the *Depositio episcoporum*, that is, the place and date of the burial of twelve popes from Lucius (A.D. 254) to Julius (A.D. 352). The second part, *Depositio martyrum*, contains the anniversaries of martyrs according to the order

¹⁰ St. John Chrysostom, *Hom. in diem Natalem Domini*, Migne, P.G. xlix, 351.

¹¹ Cabrol, *Dictionn. l.c.* I, 2997.

¹² Migne, P.L. cxxvii., 121 sqq. There are many other editions, particularly that of Mommsen in the C.I.L.I., 3333, and the *Monumenta Germ. Hist. Auct. antiquiss.* ix., etc. He has suggested some valuable emendations.

of the Calendar. Though far from complete, it forms the nucleus both of the Roman Calendar and of the Roman Martyrology, and shows what feasts were kept about the middle of the fourth century. Additions were made from time to time. Of these we get a glimpse from the Sacramentaries, the Leonine, the Gelasian and the Gregorian; from the homilies of the Fathers, from the verses of poets, such as Prudentius. But on the whole it may be said that the Roman Calendar until well into the Carolingian period remained exceedingly simple.

How these feasts were celebrated we do not know in detail. In some cases the celebration certainly implied a processional visit to the Catacomb where the martyr in question was buried; in other cases this would have been quite impossible. As to the celebration in church, special masses appear even in the earliest liturgical documents; from the Rule of St. Benedict (circa A.D. 529) we know that the monks, and most certainly the Roman church, used special psalms, antiphons and lessons on the feasts of the Saints, the psalms at Matins in Rome being nine instead of the eighteen of the Sunday office, and being for the most part a selection from the Sunday psalms.

3. THE RANK OF FEASTS

The distinction which will occupy us chiefly is between feasts simple and feasts double, that is, between feasts which were kept on one day and those which were kept on two; the two days on which double feasts were kept being the feast day itself and the corresponding day of the following week. In other terms, a double feast is, or was, a feast with an octave. This is the original and principal meaning of the expression *double feast*, until the end of the thirteenth century. I am not certain when the expression was first used, perhaps not before the eleventh century,¹³ but if not the term, at any rate the

¹³ In monastic churches the terminology is: feasts of twelve or of three lessons, or, where the Roman use is followed, of nine and three lessons respectively; in some churches feasts were distinguished by the number of cope-men at Vespers, etc.: feasts of two, four, six or more copes (*capparum*). I am by no means forgetful of another interpretation of the term *double feasts*, namely, that they were so called because the night office was doubled, the ferial office being sung at nightfall by the clergy of the church in question, and the festival office by the Papal choir. (Bæumer, l.c., 340; P. Batiffol, *Histoire du Bréviaire*

thing signified by it, goes as far back as any of our sources. The Leonine Sacramentary, indeed, has only one feast with an octave: St. Laurence (ed. Feltoe P. 99), but apart from the fact that we only have about one half of this Manuscript, its whole lay-out is far too enigmatic to serve as a proof either for or against a problem like the one before us.

Batiffol¹⁴ has restored a calendar such as must have been in force in Rome about the beginning of the ninth century. He only gives octaves to Christmas, Epiphany, St. Agnes, SS. Peter and Paul. This is certainly not correct. The octave of Epiphany is of much later date, as I shall show; that of St. Laurence, which he does not mention, is very much older. The Gelasian Sacramentary¹⁵ and the so-called Antiphonarium of St. Gregory¹⁶ of about A.D. 900, agree in assigning octaves to Christmas, St. Agnes, SS. Peter and Paul, and St. Laurence, and to no other feast, except, of course, Easter and Pentecost, the greatest and most ancient of all.

Now the question arises: why should these feasts be double, or, in other terms, have an octave? The reply will be found in the Mosaic Law. Every Israelite was bound under the heaviest penalties to celebrate certain feasts, most particularly the Passover. But there must always have been some who through no fault of their own were unable to comply with this obligation. For these a second opportunity presented itself in the feast of Pente-

romain, Paris, 1893, p. 123.) This explanation does not exactly contradict mine, because, after all, the same feasts are concerned in both cases; nevertheless I believe my explanation to be the truer one; a proof will be found later on when the meaning of "double feast" was officially altered. A further, often repeated explanation, namely, that a feast is called double when the antiphons at the greater hours are said in their entirety before and after the psalms, is a mere excuse for acknowledging one's ignorance of the true meaning.

¹⁴ L.c., p. 125.

¹⁵ Ed. H. A. Wilson, Oxford, 1894.

¹⁶ Codex San Gallensis, 359. Ed. L. Lambillotte, S.J. Brussels, 1867. It is not as old as the editor believed (A.D. 790), but the attribution to the early part of the tenth century is by no means unjustified. Schubiger, *Saengerschule von St. Gallen*, Einsiedeln, 1858, p. 78, note 6, assigns the writing to the second half of the ninth century; but on the feast of the Holy Innocents there is a reference to the Sequence by Notker Balbulus, *Laus tibi Christe*. Notker died A.D. 912, and was beatified A.D. 1512.

cost, seven weeks after the Passover. The other feasts, too, lasted a whole week, making it possible for most Israelites to take part in the solemnity.

The early Church, as soon as peace was granted her, celebrated Easter and Pentecost, the two Baptismal feasts, with a splendour hardly ever equalled since. These two weeks were almost entirely given to Divine worship, reference to the Baptismal ceremonies being especially plentiful. As these feasts always fall on Sundays, there could be no excuse for any Christian to keep away. It was different with Christmas, St. Agnes, SS. Peter and Paul and St. Laurence, which more often than not fell on weekdays. Here, especially in the earlier times, many might be unable to fulfil their duties. For these a second opportunity was given a week later; no doubt, during the week the churches were much frequented by the faithful, but just as in the old Law, the first and last days were the most solemn.

I am unable to say at what exact moment the legal obligation of hearing mass and abstaining from servile work on holy days was enacted, but it does not seem rash to think that before a legal obligation with the sanction of penalties, was established, there existed a *moral* obligation. And to the obligation, whether legal or moral, must have corresponded proper facilities. This I take to be the real origin of "double feasts," spread over two days at a week's distance, which in other terms might be called days of obligation.

The remaining feasts, without octaves, given by Batiffol and the other sources I have quoted, number about eighty; we might call them days of devotion.

There must have been some distinction between them, for some had a special mass but nothing special in the office, which was ferial, while others had the special psalms and antiphons of which St. Benedict speaks, psalms and antiphons which crystallized into what we call the Common of the Saints. In the absence of more definite information we must content ourselves with these generalities.

4. NEW RANKS

The Carolingian period, from the end of the eighth to the early tenth century, witnessed an enormous development in the Liturgy of the Church. The number of

Saints' days increased extraordinarily, and with this arose the need for a more detailed classification of feasts. Some of the Saints enjoyed a much greater popularity than others. It was the duty of the Church to foster the devotion of the faithful.

Turning to a Frankish office book of about the middle of the twelfth century,¹⁷ I notice an increase in double feasts, though I am bound to say that it is not always easy to distinguish clearly between feasts of nine lessons and doubles: Christmas, Epiphany, St. Agnes, SS. Philip and James, St. John the Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, St. Laurence, the Assumption, St. Augustine (it was a church of Austin Canons), St. Michael (the octave is not marked, probably by a mere oversight), All Saints, St. Martin and St. Andrew. There cannot be the slightest doubt that all these feasts, possibly with the exception of St. Augustine, which was "proper," were days of obligation. Other calendars of the same period will be found to agree with this practically in all details.

About this time, perhaps a little later, there arose a new rank. Naturally double feasts, quite independently of the octave, were kept with greater solemnity than simple feasts. We now meet with feasts which were to be kept with all the solemnity of a double feast, but without an octave, and these received the somewhat awkward name of semi-doubles, that is, they were doubles as far as the solemnity was concerned, but only *semi*, "half so," in as much as they had no octave. Among such feasts we find first the Epiphany (in many places), the Conversion of St. Paul, his Commemoration on 30th June, the Chair of St. Peter, generally the apostles and the doctors of the Church.

¹⁷ It belonged to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and is now in the Vatican Library, MS. Barberini, 659. I have largely used it in my *Ordinaire de l'Ordre de N.D. du Mont Carmel*, Paris, 1910. During the many years I devoted to the study of the Liturgy I did not confine myself to the Liturgical books of the Order, but continually compared them with the various other rites, regular and secular, and I kept a large mass of notes which I find it sometimes difficult to co-ordinate. If, therefore, here and in what follows I make use of my Carmelite collections it should be clearly understood that I do not allude to peculiarities of the Order, but to those matters in which it necessarily moved *pari passu* with other Orders, and particularly with the general trend of the Church.

Thus, until the end of the thirteenth century, we have four well defined ranks: doubles with octaves, semi-doubles without, feasts of nine lessons,¹⁸ and feasts of three lessons, in addition to mere commemorations. It will be seen that a semi-double was now as great a feast as the most solemn days, except that it was not a day of obligation and had no octave.

A momentous change was made A.D. 1298 by Boniface VIII. in his constitution, *Gloriosus Deus*, de reliqu. et venerat. Sanctorum, in Sexto, the Pontiff elevates the principal feasts of the Apostles, Evangelists and the four Latin Doctors, which had been semi-doubles, to the rank of double feasts, no mention being made of octaves. So we have again under a new title double feasts without octaves, just like the semi-doubles, but with this difference, that whereas the semi-doubles were merely days of devotion, these doubles without octaves became days of obligation and remained such for centuries.

Thus, from circa A.D. 1300 there are five ranks: doubles with octaves, doubles without, semi-doubles, feasts of nine and of three lessons. And as if this were not enough, we discover one more class: feasts *totum duplex*. They were the very greatest, such as Christmas and Easter, etc.

Now there begins a perfect race among feasts. They all push upwards, we never find any feast reduced in rank, but feasts of three lessons are promoted to nine, semi-doubles to doubles, and so on. On the other hand, as there is necessarily a limit to the keeping of feasts, both in monasteries and in secular churches, and as a distinction shared by many loses not a little of the lustre it had when belonging only to a few, the various ranks were ever in danger of suffering a diminution of their dignity on account of the frequency of their application, and the consequent familiarity. It would be necessary to go into minute details in order to bring this home to the reader, but perhaps our own experience may serve as example, when we see the multiplication of feasts of the first and second rank, etc.

¹⁸ I have never been able to find out the difference in the celebration between a feast of nine lessons and a semi-double. But there must have been, because the Chapter general of the Carmelite Order of 1564 decreed that lest the *cantus et officium semi-duplex* be entirely set aside the feasts of Popes who were martyrs or confessors should be given semi-double rank. Acta Capp. Gen. Ord. Carmelit. Rome, 1912, p. 460.

A word must now be added about the octaves. That these originally only consisted of the feast day and the octave day is, I believe, agreed on all hands. The solitary survival of such an octave is to be found in *S. Agnetis secundo* (28th January), which has persisted all these centuries. When octaves become more numerous in the twelfth century and after, the octave day is according to the dignity of the feast, a day of three lessons or of nine lessons, later on a semi-double, but never a double, for the obvious reason that there could not be an octave of the octave day, as double rank would have postulated. The present custom of making the octave day a double or even a double major is merely a symptom to what an extent the original meaning of the nomenclature of feasts has been forgotten.

The most extraordinary fate befell the feast of Epiphany. As late as the twelfth, or even the thirteenth century, it was merely semi-duplex, a great feast indeed, but without an octave. By the time the feast had been elevated to the rank of double (*ergo* with an octave), the octave days, and also the days within the octave in the case of very great feasts, were given the same office and mass as the feast day itself. This was not done in the case of Easter and Pentecost which, on account of the "Stations," had special masses for each day; nor in the case of Christmas, where the whole octave was taken up with other feasts. But in the case of Epiphany it so happened that the martyrology during the whole octave marked only one small feast, of St. Hyginus Pope, and hence it came to pass, quite unintentionally, that during the entire octave the office and mass of the feast were repeated, and the belief arose that it was meant as a special distinction for this feast, that it was a "privileged" octave. It was, in fact, nothing but an accident, the more accidental as by that time the race of great liturgical composers was well nigh extinct.

Most octaves are after the feast, but in the Oriental (Byzantine) church we find a number of octaves before the feast. Supposing the Byzantine church had kept the feast of the Espousals of Our Lady they would have commemorated St. Joseph not, as we do, on the feast itself, but a week before the feast. This is what I mean by an octave before the feast. Byzantine customs found their entrance into the Occident by way of Ravenna and

Milan. Hence we find in the Gallican churches the feast of the Annunciation, so intimately connected with Christmas, on the 18th of December. It spread to the Gallican churches in Spain, and thence it came back to us under the title of the Expectation of Our Lady, or, as the Spaniards say, Our Lady of the O, from the beginning of the antiphon of the Magnificat. It was only one of the feasts *pro aliquibus locis*, but it is a pity we have lost it, for it was really one of the most devotional feasts.

Another case must be mentioned before I bring this paper to an end. St. Joseph has already been mentioned in connection with the Mystery of the Incarnation. In the early eleventh century we find him first in Western service books, on the day he now occupies, March 19th. How did he get there? The answer is, that the Archangel Gabriel who saluted Our Lady, was given an "octave before the feast" of the Annunciation, March 18th. When his feast became universal in 1922¹⁹ it was transferred to the 24th, but before that it was on the 18th. St. Joseph, who also was to be commemorated, could not be placed on the 18th of March, which was already occupied by St. Gabriel, and so he was put on the next day, which is the nineteenth.

¹⁹ Considering the number of feasts of angels we now have it is surprising that one or other of the numerous old Prefaces of angels has not been restored. There is *embarras de richesse* in this matter.

STATE STERILIZATION OF THE MENTAL DEFECTIVE¹

By The Rev. HENRY DAVIS, S.J.

I.—SOME FACTS CONCERNING STERILIZATION

BEFORE discussing the subject of the legalised sterilization of the mentally defective it will be necessary to define terms.

The defective here considered is a person who is judged by a competent medical authority to be so intellectually feeble-minded as to be incapable of adapting himself or herself to social environment. This failure of adaptability to environment means that the defective is incapable of fitting into the environment of ordinary life as a socially productive unit, thus becoming a financial burden on others. We are not now considering those defectives who are sheltered and cared for by their wealthy parents, but those only who, in all cases, will have to be looked after, in or out of institutions, by the State.

The sterilization here considered may be regarded from the point of view either of the fact or of the motive. The fact is actual sexual sterilization, by whatever method it may be produced.

Normally, and for some years to come, sterilization will be induced in the male by vasectomy, and in the female by salpingectomy or some other analogous operation, in which both the fallopian tubes are severed or ligatured. The fact of sexual sterilization in the male results in shutting off permanently, or temporarily up to another remedial operation, the fertilizing male element in generation, viz., the spermatozoa, so that these have no outlet through the *vasa deferentia* for the purpose of the fertilization of the female ovule. The fact of sexual sterilization in the female results in the prevention of an ovule from making its way along the fallopian tube towards the uterus, so that the sterilized female would also fail to contribute her factor to human generation.

¹ This article, in condemnation of State Sterilization, was written before the Holy Father's Encyclical, *Casta Connubii*, condemning the practice. (EDITORS.)

Vasectomy is a slight operation, not to be confused, as some appear to have confused it, with castration, and still less with emasculation. The former of these crude operations was in vogue till early in the nineteenth century, when vasectomy was discovered to be equally effective and very much less painful and harmful.

Johann Peter Frank, a German physician, was one of the precursors of the modern eugenic movement. He urged (1779) that the mentally deficient should be castrated to prevent deterioration of the race. About 1895, 44 boys and 14 girls in the Winfield State Home, Kansas, for the feeble-minded, were castrated by order of Superintendent F. Hoyt Pilcher. This was illegal, and public opinion was so opposed to it that it was discontinued.²

In 1894, a Swedish physician introduced the practice of cutting and tying the *vas deferens*—the tube from the epididymis to the urethra—of the male, as a method of treatment in cases of disease of the prostate.

In 1899, Dr. H. Sharp, at the Indiana State Reformatory, began systematic sterilization of boys by vasectomy. That marked the beginning of eugenic sterilization in the United States.

As recently as 1911, a Committee was appointed by the Research Committee of the Eugenics section of the American Breeders' Association, Palmer, Massachusetts, to report on the best practical means of cutting off the defective germ plasm in the American population. Ten remedies were reported as possibly efficacious, namely, Life segregation (or segregation during the reproductive period), Sterilization, Restrictive marriage laws, Eugenic education of the public, System of mating, General environmental betterment, Polygamy, Euthanasia, Neo-Malthusianism, Laissez-faire.³

Of these suggested remedies, two held the field, namely, segregation and sterilization. The battle now rages round these two, at least in England at present, and the issue is going to be decided, unless we are mistaken, on purely economic grounds. If it is found that sterilization meets with a fair measure of popular support, then sterilization it will be, and Catholic doctors will have to face another problem added to their many other moral problems, the

² Gosney and Popenoe, *Sterilization for Human Betterment*.

³ Stanley Davies, in *Social Control of the Mentally Deficient*, p. 95.

latest of which is the qualified approval given by the Government (1930) to the teaching of birth control at publicly supported clinics for Maternity and Infant Welfare.

After this brief account of the history of sterilization we may now consider the effects of the operation.

Vasectomy has no effect other than sterility. It leaves the male sexually capable, so far as physical intercourse is concerned. It does not diminish sexual desire or potency. In a few cases it has increased sexual desire, but this result may be attributed to other causes. Therefore, the plea of some Moral Theologians that the operation increases sexuality may now be dismissed. In many cases, vasectomy has had a beneficial effect on the health. Indeed, it has been used in the Steinach method of rejuvenation, the principle being that in vasectomized males there is no loss of vitality due to seminal emissions. In such cases, the hormones of the testicular internal secretion—as the modern theory supposes—are able to flow into the blood stream and perform their beneficent work throughout the whole organism. On the physical basis, therefore, there is a good deal to be said in favour of vasectomy, though not, of course, for the mere purpose of sterilizing the defective that he may not procreate.

In the case of female sterilization, the operation is more complicated, as the abdomen has to be opened, incisions made, and the tubes cut or ligatured. There is also some danger attached to the operation, though authors maintain that it has been reduced to a negligible quantity. But the characteristic secretions of the ovaries, the ovarian hormones, continue to do their work, and the ovules bursting from the ovaries are ineffective for generation. Thus the effect of sterilization on the female organism is not harmful, provided the ovaries are not interfered with, for the ovaries play as important a rôle in female development as do the internal secreting male sexual organs.

The motive for sterilizing the defective is, we may hasten to say, not by any means for the benefit of the patient. The end aimed at is that defectives may not be able to contribute any element to generation, and consequently, that they may not add to the burden of the State in maintaining defective children. This economic plea assumes, of course, that defective parents will beget defective children. That is indeed true in general, but

the reader will carefully distinguish between these two statements, namely, that defective parents beget defective children, generally speaking, and that the existing defectives are the offspring of defectives. The second of these statements is not true. It is estimated that 11% of defectives are born of defectives, whereas 89% are born of normal parents, who consequently are said to be "carriers" of defect. It is also a fact that the normal child born of defective parents will be the exception. In England and Wales it is computed that there are 300,000 defectives, or nearly 8 per 1,000 of the population are defective. It has also been estimated that for one defective there are 30 "carriers," so that nine million people in these countries carry defect. On similar computations, it was estimated at the period of the war (1917) that about fifty million of the people of the United States carried defect and were in fact defective, as having a mental age below 13 years. This inference was, of course, ridiculed, as well it might be. Relying then on verified facts, we must admit that the number of genuine defectives is large, and some measure to safeguard the general body of the people must be applied to the problem.

Whether defectiveness is due to heredity or to pre-natal or to post-natal environment, the argument of this article is not affected. The defectives are amongst us; they appear to increase in number. It is proposed to sterilize all existing defectives, for it is assumed that their children, if they had any, would be defective.

Now though hereditary defectiveness may not be proved up to the hilt, it is true that defectives breed defectives, and if that source of infection, as it were, can be checked, so much the better for the general well-being and financial competence of the public. We do not wish to deny hereditary defectiveness. We will not base arguments on controverted points. The Catholic theologian will find that his case will prove to be a weak one if he bases arguments on a denial of heredity. It has always appeared to us not a very convincing plea, urged even by so acknowledged an authority as Dr. Tredgold, that sterilization should be opposed on the ground that if all the defectives now existing were sterilized, the effect on the next generation would be negligible (3 to 5% decrease of defectiveness). The plea is good as far as it goes, but the fact is hard to establish, and many people would favour even that small decrease in the number of defectives.

The foregoing remarks might at first sight give encouragement to the extreme eugenist, as savouring of the approval of sterilization. But though the Catholic may go part of the way with the eugenist, he comes at last to a point beyond which he may not move an inch. When that point has been reached, the Catholic is termed unsocial and cruel. The sight of defective children moves the eugenist to tears. Whilst holding a cloth to his streaming eyes with his right hand, he is offering with his left all kinds of contraceptives to the poor, whose children would, in great measure, be as eugenic as his own.

II.—THE CATHOLIC VIEW OF STERILIZATION OF THE MENTALLY DEFECTIVE

The question suggested by this heading is this : Is there a Catholic view on sterilization of the defective, the purpose of which is that the defective may be prevented from procreating?

There is no official Catholic view in the sense that there has been no general decree issued by a Roman Congregation. But there is a general Catholic view on the subject. There is moral unanimity against sterilization, as explained, on the theoretical aspect, and there is absolute unanimity on the present practical aspect of it.

Since there is no official view on the subject, it has been maintained that the question of legalised sterilization of the defective is an open one for Catholics. That is true inasmuch as no Catholic is as yet obliged by any disciplinary decree to hold the view adverse to sterilization. But we very much doubt whether a Catholic may say that the question is an open one in the adequate sense of the term, seeing that so many Catholic theologians condemn the procedure and so few permit it in the abstract. The few who permit it in the abstract would permit it when the State is in an emergency. But they certainly deny that the emergency exists at present.

The Catholic writers who are adverse to sterilization as explained are as follows :—

1. Fr. Finney, C.M., in *Moral Problems in Hospital Practice*, says (p. 149): "Sterilization, when directly intended as an end or as a means to an end, is immoral, and no ultimate purpose, however good, can morally justify it."

2. Fr. E. F. Burke, in *Acute Cases in Moral Medicine*, says (p. 57): "The State has no right to authorise (operations or treatment for) sterilization."

3. Fr. Slater, S.J., in *Questions of Moral Theology*, says (p. 266): "We may then conclude that neither morality nor science approves of the sterilization of the degenerate in order to prevent them from propagating their kind."

4. Fr. A. Koch, D.D., in *Handbook of Moral Theology*, says (p. 84, vol. 3): "Vasectomy and the excision of the uterus or ovaries are operations which, though permissible when necessary for the direct preservation of life or health, would be sinful if performed for the sole purpose of superinducing sterility."

5. Fr. Noldin, S.J., in *Theol. Mor. II n. 328*, says: "Patet vasectomiam ab auctoritate publica nec in poenam criminis imponi nec tanquam medium impediendi generationes infirmas vel noxias adhiberi posse." In a footnote he cites Ferreres, Capelmann-Bergman and Zeitschrift f.k.Theol.

6. FF. Coppens-Spalding, in *Moral Principles and Medical Practice* (p. 250), says: "The State oversteps its authority in inflicting grave mutilation on an individual. Integrity of body is an inalienable right. No legislative power of the State may deprive a person of this right, as it may not deprive him of life itself without the due process and as a just punishment." The author is here speaking of criminals, but his argument applies with even greater force to the case of the defective.

7. FF. Aertnys-Damen, C.SS.R., in *Theol. Mor. I. n. 568*, says: "Nec hoc (scil, vasectomiam vel oophorectomiam) jubere licet auctoritati publicae ob bonum commune."

8. Fr. Cappello, S.J., in *de Matrim. n. 376*, lays it down for certain that the operation for sterilization is wrong except to save the life of the individual. The author refers to the practice in the United States and condemns it.

10. V. Rev. Canon de Smet, in *de Spons. et Matrim. n. 440*, definitely asserts that the State has no right to impose the operation. He cites the 54th decree of the fourth Council of Mechlin, whose words are worth recording:—"Nunquam licere etiam ob praetensam selectionem humanam, quemadmodum in quibusdam regionibus

praepostere factum esse noscitur, virum aut mulierem per operationem chirurgicam data opera, ineptum reddere ad fecundum matrimonium." He also cites a long array of authors in his favour: De Becker, Vermeersch, Salsmans, De Villers, Schmitt, Wouters, Stucchi, Eschbach, Tanqueray.

11. FF. Sabetti-Barrett in *Theol. Mor. n. 267*, condemns legalised sterilization and denies all probability to the opposite view.

12. P. Michel in *Dict. de Theol. Cath. s.v. Mutilation*, also condemns it.

13. Abbé J. Bricourt, in *Dict. Prat. des Conn. Relig. s.v. Castration*, condemns it.

14. Dom Prümmer, O.P., *Manuale Theol. Mor. II. 116*, also condemns eugenic sterilization.

We may, therefore, say that the common Catholic view is opposed to sterilization of defectives. The few who take a contrary view on merely theoretical grounds do not, we think, establish anything like a remotely probable opinion, as probabilities are understood in the schools.

It will not be necessary to submit the theoretical opinion of the minority view to criticism, since the aim of this article is to present to the reader what is the accepted view among Catholic writers of acknowledged authority. We do not, we fear, attach any weight to occasional Catholic writers to the general Press, and we do not consider them to be authorities to quote. When one is asked what is the Catholic view on a given subject, one goes to Catholic text-books such as are used in Catholic seminaries. Those have borne the brunt of criticism, and it seems to the writer that if an opinion is repeated in one book after another, that opinion and that alone can be said to be the Catholic opinion.

It is important, however, to remember that those authors who admit in theory the right of the State to sterilize the defective do not admit that right in the present circumstances, so that the view against sterilization is all the more general and pronounced. We will cite the words of the minority that the matter may be beyond doubt. Thus, Dr. Ryan has written recently in *Moral Aspects of Sterilization*, p. 22: "Legal sterilization is not morally justified at the present time in the United States. The two conditions necessary to render it morally lawful

do not exist. In the first place, the social and other inconveniences and evils resulting from feeble-mindedness do not constitute a grave danger to the common welfare. In the second place, the limitations to the effectiveness of the measure are so great as to render it fatally inadequate as a remedy for feeble-mindedness. Its main limitations are as follows:—It is not necessary for those mental defectives who cannot safely be left outside of institutions, nor for those whom the State should not permit to marry on account of their incapacity to bring up a family; not all defectives always produce defective offspring; by far the greater part of inherent defectiveness comes from 'carriers,' and these cannot be identified; possibly one half, and possibly more than that proportion, of the feeble-minded have not acquired the defect by inheritance; sterilization is practically applicable only to defectives who have been committed to institutions, and these apparently are only one-eightieth of the whole number; the practice is liable to serious abuses, either inherent or incidental; it is opposed by several of the most competent authorities; finally, it tends to prevent the consideration and adoption of genuine remedies which would deal with the feeble-mindedness which is caused by environment as well as that which is inherited.

"In view of all these facts, it seems clear that the right of the individual to his physical integrity is superior to the right of the State to seek by means of compulsory sterilization social benefits which are relatively insignificant, if not positively doubtful. Therefore, no Catholic lawmaker should support this legislation, nor should any Catholic physician participate in the surgical operations which it imposes, except under protest and when refusal would entail the loss of his position or office."

This reasoning of Dr. Ryan applies only to compulsory sterilization. The question of voluntary sterilization must be judged on ethical grounds.

It remains to record the opinion of Dr. J. Mayer, who, some months ago, was generally cited in the public Press as in favour of sterilization of the unfit. His view of the matter in the concrete situation of to-day is given by Rev. C. P. Bruehl, in *Birth Control and Eugenics*, p. 238. "Briefly, the question of the lawfulness of the sterilization of the unfit by public authority may be summarized in the following manner. Society has the right to protect

itself adequately against the danger resulting from the presence and the increase of the mentally diseased. If sterilization can be proved to be the only sufficient means by which this purpose can be accomplished and national degeneration staved off, public authority cannot be denied the right to use it for the protection of the common good, which, according to the teaching of moral theology, prevails over private interests. From this abstract argument, however, it is a far cry to the practical conclusion that the State in the present condition of affairs actually may exercise this theoretical right. For, as things are at present, national degeneration is not imminent, and consequently the right of national self-preservation may not be invoked. Besides, sterilization is not the only means available for the protection of the community, and as long as other means, more consonant with human dignity and less subject to serious abuses, can achieve the same purpose, the State may not resort to this drastic measure, which cannot but be regarded as a grave mutilation and constitutes a violation of human personality that requires for its justification a commensurate cause. Whatever, therefore, may be said with regard to the theoretical aspects of the case, which are not entirely clear, in practice, eugenical sterilization of the unfit cannot be justified at the present stage of affairs and must be condemned as an unwarranted assault on human rights. This in substance is the position defended by Dr. Joseph Mayer."

III.—THE ETHICAL ARGUMENT.

Having set forth the opinions of both schools of thought, the writer will now attempt to submit to the reader what he apprehends to be the ethical argument against sterilization of defectives.

The ethical view of the subject means simply the judgment one has to pass on the right or the wrong of the sterilization of the defective, a judgment based on the relations of the individual to the common good. To define that view more closely, in the present situation the question really is: Would the benefits to the general body of the citizens, and that an economic benefit, derived from such sterilization, justify that procedure on rational, moral and ethical grounds? Now in dealing with other people, we are bound as rational human beings to respect their natural rights. Thus, a man has a natural right

to his life, good name and bodily integrity, until he has forfeited those rights by crime. These rights are called natural not legal, because they exist independently of men combining into any polity. Those rights are not given to men by any human law. Man had them before any law was made. He retains them, he does not subordinate them to the benefit of other men, not even when he agrees to live with others in an ordered commonwealth. This relation between a man and other men is founded on his personal independence in the use of his powers and faculties for his own personal perfection and for his own happiness. If a man libels me, he acts against my rights, and therefore against justice and against his own rational nature. Similarly, no part of my body is subservient to the mere advantage of another person or set of persons or the State. Every part and function of my body is subordinated to my whole body and its continued well-being and life. Consequently, an innocent person, i.e., one not guilty of any moral and legal crime, retains the natural right which he had and has to his life, good name and bodily integrity. I may cut off a part of my body to save my whole body or health or life, but another may not cut off part of my body merely for his own benefit, nor could a collection of men nor the State do so. The mentally defective, even of the lowest type, a Jukes sister, or a Carrie Buck, or a Kallikak, is not a criminal merely for being defective. The bodily members of the defective are just as sacrosanct as are mine. They may not be cut off merely for the benefit of others. To sterilize the defective, merely that he or she may not propagate to the subsequent detriment, financial or other, of citizens, would be to subordinate a human being to the benefit of others. Such a procedure is contrary to the first principles of natural justice and rational conduct. Therefore, the conclusion, as it appears to the present writer, from researches into the present Catholic view, and from the first principles of rational conduct, is that the sterilization of the mentally defective in order to prevent their procreating defective children cannot be defended. It would be an invasion of personal rights without any justification. To say that it would be in self-defence of the State is to admit that evil may be done that good may ensue.

In order to complete the treatment of the subject, it must be shown that if the State wishes to sterilize defectives with their consent, since consent cannot be validly

given, so morally it may not be used. The sinful and unnatural giving of consent to personal mutilation cannot justify the State in invoking that consent as its justification.

We do not believe that this country will emulate the notorious and unenviable pre-eminence of California in the matter of legalised compulsory sterilization, but it may salve its public conscience, or attempt to do so, by sterilizing only those who give consent, personally or by proxy, to that procedure. It must be obvious to any reader that legalised sterilization with consent before discharge shades off by insensible degrees to compulsory sterilization. There are innumerable ways of extorting consent. Public policy may be unobjectionable, but official action is usually most objectionable. It is notorious that a law-giver cannot see that the law is carried out equitably or even justly.

That voluntary sterilization is going to become a practical issue we have not the smallest doubt. There is a growing tendency amongst a very vocal minority to force sterilization on to the Statute book. The following facts taken from Gosney and Popenoe show plainly how the tendency grows.

Voluntary sterilization of persons who are not defective is not unknown in the United States. Many women have been sterilized at their own request to prevent future pregnancies, euphemistically for their health. Fewer men have undergone the operation, as it is not deemed so necessary. Some hospitals sterilize a woman who cannot go to full term with a pregnancy. At one public hospital, 500 women have been sterilized within the last ten years. Discharge of defective girls after sterilization is not so common. In one institution, of 66 girls sent to hospital only for sterilization, seven were discharged afterwards. Women are sent by social workers for sterilization, mainly because they have borne as many children as they can take care of. Another group consists of girls of low grade intelligence, whose parents have them sterilized and then keep them at home. Such was the case of a 15-year old girl, of the mental age of three years. After giving birth to an illegitimate child she was sent to be sterilized.

Now Catholic Philosophy, as the reader knows, condemns sexual sterilization, even if voluntary, for the pur-

pose of avoiding future pregnancies. It is a mutilation that is condemned. There are other ways of avoiding procreation. As well might a kleptomaniac ask for his hands to be cut off in order that he might not steal. Every mutilation of the body, not necessary for the preservation of the whole body, is an assumption of complete and absolute dominion over the body. As a man has not such complete dominion over his life, so he has not complete dominion over the separate parts and functions of his body. Each part and function has been given by Nature, i.e., by God, for the fulfilment of a definite purpose. At the same time, a man has the administration of every part of his body for the sake of the whole body, and may therefore sacrifice a part of his body if the physical good of his whole body imperatively requires this sacrifice. Another point of view is the following. A man naturally tends towards the perfection of his nature, and by the laws of his being he is bound to do so. All the faculties of his mind and the functions of his body subserve that tendency. Consequently, it is contrary to natural law directly to destroy any bodily member or function, unless that member or function, being diseased or being an obstacle in some way to the preservation of the whole body, prevents him from achieving his physical perfection or well-being.

As it is usual in the schools to consider objections to a doctrine proposed, it may not be out of place here to reply to the one and only objection to the Catholic opposition to sterilization of the mentally defective that has any superficial validity in it.

Up to the time of Pope Benedict XIV, the Church tolerated the presence of eunuchs in church choirs. This hoary objection is raised at every meeting where a Catholic speaks against sterilization. The reply that is always given by Catholics is that all theologians now condemn castration for vocal purposes, there were never more than a few, against the majority, who admitted castration with consent of the boy singer, the Church never approved of the practice, but, finding the practice in vogue and favoured by the secular authorities, these singers were tolerated and their services were accepted. The reader who is interested in this antiquated objection will find the matter fully treated by Pope Benedict XIV, who roundly condemned it, in his *de Synodo diocesana*, lib. xi. c. 7, n. iv.

"A LOVERS' QUARREL"

By THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

IN the latter half of last year the B.B.C. instituted a series of weekly lectures on science and religion. In the autumn the *Spectator* advertised a discussion under the heading, "The Challenge to Religious Orthodoxy," in which the protagonists of Faith and Unfaith were to hold the platform on alternate Saturdays. Not to be outdone by its Sabbatine rival, the *Sunday Express* published tens of thousands of words by such well-known scientists and publicists as Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Arthur Keith, Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. Bertrand Russell and Mr. James Douglas, who have given more or less directly the reason of the faith (or unfaith) that was in them. Meantime, Sir James Jeans published what was surely the book of the year. *The Mysterious Universe* sold to the extent of 18,000 copies in the month of November alone, and provided the occasion of a long correspondence in *The Times*.

What is the significance of this revival of interest in a controversy which takes us back to the Victorian era? Is it a factitious interest roused by the wiliness of publicists at their wits' end for "copy," or does it reflect a stirring of the hearts of men anxious to know where they stand? Whatever be the truth of its origin, the storm has disturbed the complacency of a vast number of people, raised a number of philosophically interesting questions, brought to light a narrow seam of anti-religious intolerance, and evoked a defence of religion from the inner stronghold of science itself. On the whole there has been an absence of the passion which coloured the disputes of half a century ago; there may be good reason for the note of regret in Dean Inge's remark that we were all growing too polite. Principal Jacks, summing up the B.B.C. debate, calls the conflict of science and religion "A lovers' quarrel."¹

As Catholics we were rather outside the disturbance; the faith that survived the big metal of the last war would not go down before the poison gas of hereditary

¹ *Listener*, Dec. 17th.

antagonists in this, nor did it need the well-meant support which it welcomed as valuable for those who were not standing on the rock. But as priests, we had much to engage our attention. In the first place, we had the opportunity of observing the religious position of masses of our fellow countrymen, and of hearing a clear exposition of the foundations on which their convictions were supposed to rest. If we felt that those foundations were laid on shifting sands we must examine them carefully. Moreover, we were brought up sharp against an advance in physical science which calls for the notice of the philosopher. It had long been known to the student of cosmology that the physicist was soaring to regions whose air was too rarified for any but a few intrepid fliers; he must needs wait until they came to earth again and told him what they had seen. They have come down and have spoken eagerly, and often beautifully, as men who have seen a vision, but, as such men will, they tell us that there is much that is incommunicable and much more that they cannot grasp themselves. And from it all they have drawn conclusions which are supposed to remove difficulties from the paths of believers; but I am not sure that they have not raised more ghosts than they have laid. It is obviously not yet the time to attempt to estimate the philosophical import of Relativity or the Quantum Theory, but we may record some of the inferences which men like Sir James Jeans have so admirably expressed.

Mathematicians and physicists hold the centre of the stage at present, and it is among them that Mr. Bernal, of whom I shall speak later, finds most of the scientific apologists of religion. Jeans, Eddington, Fleming have all made recently some confession of belief in God.

Let us begin with Sir James Jeans. The first line of defence of the philosopher when he is attacked by the scientist is the declaration that his antagonist has no authority in this matter. That observation is as important as it is obvious, but it often leaves the scientist undismayed. It is indisputable that every man has a right to philosophise, just as he has a right to think about religion. It is an unwarrantable invasion of man's liberty of investigation and of speech, to say that he who is a professional chemist or physiologist must confine his observations to the laboratory; for the scientist has a right, perhaps a duty, when he leaves his laboratory and

goes home to his wife and family as plain Mr. Jones, to ask himself, What is all this science about? Whither is it leading? How can it be fitted into the general scheme of the universe? What are the answers to the questions which start out from my observations but which no scientific observation can solve? Only, when he favours the world with the results of his desultory, parergal and non-professional thinking, he should be heard not as Mr. Jones, F.R.S., but simply as Mr. Jones, a very clever man no doubt, and very amiable, but of no more authority here than he is in music or Greek verse. But the most striking characteristic of much of the anti-religious talk of scientists is the casualness, the dilettantism, the self-sufficiency and contempt for work of the past two thousand years with which they approach the discussion. It is as if a theologian should say: " I don't believe in these electrons; nobody has ever seen one "; or, " There's no need to bother about relativity; it is obvious nonsense "; or, " There can be no such thing as evolution, for the idea conflicts with the first chapters of Genesis "; or, " Why consider science at all? It cannot have any bearing on philosophy or religion."

But just as no serious theologian would dismiss the results of scientific research thus summarily, so there are many scientists who when they approach the subject matter of religion, the questions of the existence of God, the nature of the soul and its immortality, the Incarnation, miracles, speak reverently, humbly and dispassionately.

Thus Sir James Jeans writes in his preface: " Every man may claim the right to draw his own conclusions from the facts produced by modern science. This chapter [the last of his book] merely contains the interpretations which I, a stranger in the realms of philosophic thought, feel inclined to place upon the scientific facts and hypotheses described in the main part of the book." Similarly, Sir Arthur Eddington, in his B.B.C. lecture, as reported in the *Listener* of November 26th, said: " If I say anything on this [the philosophic] side of the question it is not as a scientist that I claim to speak."

Now the fact of prime importance which emerges from all these modern physical investigations is that the physical universe has yielded its secrets to mathematical investigations more completely than to any other mode

of enquiry. The mechanical concepts which won such universal acceptance in the nineteenth century and which were always condemned by scholastic philosophers, have been rejected as alien to the nature of reality and embarrassing to the progress of knowledge. The idea of material atoms, passive, immutable, eternal, the playthings of merely transient motion from without, agglomerated by blind chance into bodies every movement of every one of which was prescribed by ineluctable necessity, has been blown out of the minds of men, let us hope for ever. The nineteenth century habit of mind was to regard every manifestation of force or movement in the whole universe as subject to the law of the machine and explicable by the science of mechanics. The enormous magnitudes of astronomy and the infinitesimal masses of atomic physics, the nutrition and growth of animals, the voluntary acts of man, all were approached as one would set out to analyse the movements of a steam engine or the flight of a bullet. The theory of vitalism was scouted and the great advances of the science of physiology were ascribed to the use of the mechanical hypothesis. Free-will was attacked as being opposed to the principle of the conservation of energy.

Now it has been found that in the investigation of the movements of electrons the mechanical hypothesis is barren. It has been abandoned in favour of the symbolism of pure mathematics. This has led to a complete *volte-face*. It is proclaimed now that there is no necessity anywhere. The "law of indeterminacy" is supposed to be found in the constituents of the atom. This is doubtless hailed as a gift from the gods by many apologists of religion who recognise how damaging to their cause was the determinist theory, and indeed that is how the scientist expects us to accept his findings. So Sir Arthur Eddington, in his admirable B.B.C. lecture, said: "So far as we have yet gone in our probing of the material universe, we cannot find a particle of evidence in favour of determinism. The denial of determinism is not merely qualitative but quantitative; we have actually a mathematical formula showing just how far the course of events deviates from complete predictability. I do not think that there is any serious division as to the decrease of determinism. . . . There is no longer any need to doubt our intuition of free-will. Our minds are not merely registering a predetermined sequence of thought and deci-

sions. Our purpose, our volition are genuine; and ours is the responsibility for what ensues from them. For we are scarcely likely to accept a theory which would make the human spirit more mechanistic than the physical universe."

One should not look a gift horse in the mouth. But while I want free-will for myself I do not want free-will for an atom. And that is how the physicists speak of it. Am I to go on to argue that the electron contains a spiritual principle? But I believe that in its benevolent eagerness to undo the wickedness of its past, science has again gone beyond its evidence; its gesture of restitution has reduced it to bankruptcy. I am not competent to question the facts, but I am forced to doubt the inferences. That the behaviour of electrons is under the "law of indeterminacy," I am quite ready to believe; that its movements can be embraced only by a "wave of probability," I think I can understand. But is not that because the investigating instrument is not even yet sufficiently perfect? Does Sir Arthur Eddington really want us to let the principle of causality slip away in return for the agreement about free-will? This would indeed be a sop to Cerberus. He does not say that he does. But listen to his colleague. Sir James Jeans writes: "Thus, although we are still far from any positive knowledge, it seems probably that there may be some factor, for which we have so far found no better name than fate, operating in nature to neutralize the cast-iron inevitability of the old law of causation."² "These and other considerations . . . have led many physicists to suppose that there is no determinism in events in which atoms and electrons are involved singly and that the apparent determination of large scale events is only of a statistical nature."³

In *Religion and the Reign of Science*, the Rev. F. L. Cross, purporting to describe an inference from the Quantum Theory, writes: "Here, then, we have an instance of the law of causality being questioned by physics itself. The bugbear of universal causation seems to be a myth which even the scientists are forced to abandon. And many thinkers who have felt the burden of a universe

² Loc. cit., p. 25.

³ P. 28.

ruled by natural laws have welcomed this avenue of escape which the physicists are now affording."⁴

But if there is no principle of causality, by what right does Sir James conclude from the facts of science that the author of the universe is a pure mathematician?

Completely neglecting this pertinent question, a number of critics in the correspondence columns of *The Times* protested against this novel and seemingly derogatory idea of God. It was argued that equally valid inferences to divergent concepts of God might be drawn from biological, psychological, æsthetic, and even (as a *reductio ad absurdum*) criminal phenomena. Sir William Schooling at once wanted to know why, if a mathematician found God to be a mathematician, a musician should not equally find Him a musician. And he concludes: "In crude language we seem to be inferring a number of divine attributes or to be setting up a fresh pantheon consisting of a number of departmental deities." Sir James Jeans defends himself against those who interpret him as saying that there is nothing but mathematics to be found in the universe. He meant nothing of the kind. He can see the wood as well as the trees. Nor will he allow that he is the victim of mathematical blinkers. He made a quite delightfully adequate reply to Mr. C. E. M. Joad, who had tried to bring home this objection by a Socratic dialogue in the columns of the *Spectator*. His contention is that nature has shown itself patient of the approach through mathematical concepts when all other approaches proved to be *culs-de-sac*.

I would suggest that perhaps this success is due to the fact that mathematics studies the nature of our experience under the one aspect which is most universal; neglecting everything that particularises this or that nature, rejecting every restricting model that is derived from a particular type of matter, it concentrates on quantity alone. Once you have found in nature quantity, discrete or continuous, space, time, motion, number, extension, you have the material object of your mathematics. The rest is a process of inference, now helped, now hampered by the experience of the quantity of this or that particular kind of body. You may drive right away from experience into the realms of imagination, but if you cling to pure reason in your flight you will eventually come back

⁴ P. 31.

to the truth which tallies with experience. Take the very simple mathematical concept of the square root of -1 . As it stands it is staggeringly remote from anything in this world. In using it I cannot get a glimmering of reasonableness into that which is behind the symbol. But presently I multiply this monstrous "quantity" by itself, and at once I am back again on a patch of sure ground labelled -1 , which is as real as losing a sovereign or falling off a 'bus. So it may be with some of the amazing and disturbing things that mathematicians tell us about electrons, their impermanence or rhythm, the discontinuity of their motion. Moreover, when they confess that they are faced with apparent contradictions, that their results are irreconcilable with each other, may it not be that they have not yet adequately freed themselves from alien concepts, that "waves" and "missiles" are the hampering remains of the swaddling clothes of their mechanical infancy which they have not had the courage completely to discard? Perhaps a still more perfect abstraction, a greater generalization will achieve more harmony and a more deeply penetrating vision.

And similarly, although we find such startling words about the principle of causality and the uniformity of nature, perhaps these scientists have been merely confessing their ignorance of some of the factors of the problem. They have found a loose-jointedness in nature which was not hitherto suspected, an unpredictability in the course of natural events; the idea of predictability was involved with causality, and it is taken for granted that they stand or fall together.

The truth of the matter, surely, is contained in the familiar doctrine of the schools. The various natures about us, and the laws of their interaction are a reflex of God's wisdom in planning the universe. When we study nature we are aiming at the objective truth of things as they are. There is correspondence between our true knowledge and their ontological truth, their realization of the Creator's plan. Thus from a knowledge of the things that are made we can, by a triple process of affirmation, negation and transcendence, arrive at an analogical knowledge of God. That knowledge must always be incomplete, for finite minds cannot compass the infinite, but it is true as far as it goes, and the first results of our knowledge will vary according to the line of our approach.

But for all this we need the principle of causality. Without that, anything may have come anyhow, and the study of it will lead anywhere or nowhere. But this line of argument finds little favour.

And yet there is a growing consensus of opinion that there is a God to be worshipped. That must have been evident to all who followed the B.B.C. course of lectures. But another thing was painfully obvious. These men did not base their conviction on anything which would stand the test of logical analysis. Over and over again one heard the words, "Religious experience," "Spiritual experience." Sir James Jeans, without anything like a proof (and there is no need to quarrel with him for that: apologetic was not his business) seems to take it for granted that there is an artificer of the universe, and then sets out to show why it is reasonable to think of that artificer as a "pure mathematician." Sir Arthur Eddington, writing perhaps with less detachment but with even more definite repudiation of any claim to pontifical authority in these matters, makes it plain that the believer has nothing to fear from science. "If I say anything positive on this side of the question it is not as a scientist that I claim to speak."⁵ But it is as a scientist that he gives the valuable assurance that no finding of science need, or can, disturb the Christian's faith in God. For him, too, the findings of mathematical physics are no more than a symbolic statement of reality, hopelessly inadequate to that reality. All that is spiritual is beyond the reach of its calculus. The questing spirit that asks what is the truth about physical nature, by that very question is manifestly above and beyond the object of its investigation. But, asked for an assurance that a personal God is a reality, he replies: "I doubt whether there is any assurance to be obtained except through the power of the religious experience itself; but I bid [the questioner] hold fast to his own intimate knowledge of the nature of that experience. I think that will take him nearer to the ultimate proof than the codifiers and symbolisers can reach." And then he confesses to a feeling for subjectivism. Sir Ambrose Fleming, Emeritus Professor of Engineering, University College, London, speaks with a more certain voice: "There are powerful and unmistakable indications in nature of purposive

⁵ *Listener*, Nov. 26th, 1930.

thought and of order, and the adaptation of means to an end which cannot be the result of mere chance; nor can they be the result of impersonal agencies or principles, such as those included under the term evolution, but must be the product of a Supreme Intelligence. . . . That type of philosophy which assumes the existence of strict determinism in the inorganic world and seeks for the mechanistic explanation of the phenomena of living matter, denying the existence of choice or free-will, is now shown to be fundamentally unscientific and inconsistent with ascertained physical principles."⁶

Professor Alexander, the philosopher, writes "that religion has no call modestly to urge that spirit and God count for something in the world, but that a scientifically-minded person needs to recognise religion in order to have a satisfactory view of the world."⁷ And then he proceeds to evolve a notion of a God who "is not a creator as in historical religions, but created"!

The chief objection to be made to these witnesses to God is, then, their rejection of external criteria as a foundation of the proof of the existence of God (it does not apply to them all), and their insistence on those internal criteria which, though they may have a value, can never be the sole basis of our belief, as is maintained in the *Pascendi*.

But there are particular attitudes taken up by some of them which, while they are not so fundamental, still have a far-reaching, though oftentimes unrecognized, efficacy for unbelief. Sir Arthur Eddington touched upon one aspect of the problem which is brilliantly manifested and emphasized by Sir James Jeans in much of his popular work, and treated expressly in *The Mysterious Universe*. Both alike are the slaves of the "idol" of size. If anybody, surely the modern physicist should be freed of this servitude and intellectual embarrassment. To say nothing of the spectroscope, is not the very first lesson of the microscope to show us that to be impressed by mere size is a delusion? Is not the revelation of the perfect organization of the cell as great a marvel as the close-seen majesty of sun and moon and stars? Is not the planetary course of electrons about their nucleus as awe-inspiring as the rushing speed of nebulae through space? Yet in

⁶ *The Times*, Dec. 2nd, 1930.

⁷ *Listener*, Dec. 3rd, 1930.

one of his most brilliant passages Sir James writes : "We find the universe terrifying because of its vast meaningless distances, terrifying because of its inconceivably long vistas of time which dwarf human history to the twinkling of an eye, terrifying because of our extreme loneliness, and because of the material insignificance of our home in space—a millionth part of a grain of sand out of all the sea-sand of the world. But above all else, we find the universe terrifying because it appears to be indifferent to life like our own : emotion, ambition, achievement, art and religion all seem equally foreign to its plan. Perhaps indeed we ought to say that it appears to be actively hostile to life like our own. . . . Into such a universe we have stumbled, if not exactly by mistake, at least as the result of what may properly be described as an accident."⁸

Again, both of these distinguished physicists refuse to recognise any impossibility in the evolution of life from non-living matter, though neither of them would allow that we are within imaginable distance of the artificial production of life, and even if we achieved that, Sir Arthur Eddington, at least, maintains that we should still be far from that essential characteristic of human life which is self-consciousness. With the utmost respect for these two eminent scientists, it seems to me that such hankering after abiogenesis is a survival from the mechanistic bias of the nineteenth century, and that the appeal to the possibilities of the unknown is in the light of Pasteur's experiments a momentary betrayal of the scientific spirit. But passing that, and insisting only on their concessions, human life, far from being insignificant in this universe, stands out as its most significant element, an element which refuses to be dwarfed by the unimaginable distances of stellar space or the almost incredible multiplication of light-years. "Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus"—if you were to take it in its literalness you would prick the bubble of Horace's wit. No mother mountain would need to hang its head over such a progeny, for in spite of their size no mountain is *in itself*, as significant as the "wee, sleekit, cow'rin', tim'rous beastie." The scale of values is determined by degrees of immanence, as Fr. D'Arcy has so clearly pointed out in his recent *Thomas Aquinas*,⁹ and of all

⁸ P. 3, s.

⁹ Cap. 8, § 2.

God's creatures in this universe of our experience none other has so high a degree of immanence as man.

It may seem that in following these red herrings one is drawn away from the main trail of the argument. But if I am not very much mistaken, it is *obiter dicta* such as these which have the greatest values for the man in the street; they may be lightly thrown off at the microphone end but they acquire volume in the loud speaker.

Let us then consider the reply which might be expected from one who was urging this "size" argument as a formal objection against the received teaching of Christianity. "You are missing my point," he might say. "Even granting the truth of all you allege about the significance of mice and men, still what are we to say of the wisdom that builds for men a house so big that man cannot see its boundaries, that sets up in the sky lamps of vastest power but so far away that their light takes millions of years to reach us, and when it does reach us makes no appreciable difference to our darkness? We are not maintaining that the house is more important than the man, but merely that it is too big for the man. It offends against that principle of economy which is obvious in nature and which we associate with the possession of wisdom."

But is it right to associate economy so closely with wisdom? In the spiritual order God seems to be lavish in His generosity, why not in the material order also? Are we justified in applying our human standards to God? It is true that if we approach by mere reason they are the only standards we have at our disposal. But merely natural theology leads us to the knowledge of God as Infinite Being and as such utterly removed from any adequate comparison with man. And revelation has supplemented our knowledge, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord and who hath been his counsellor?" And finally, why should we take it for granted that this universe is built solely for man's material well-being, even though it is his dwelling-place and the religious claim of man's outstanding significance is true? Is it not intelligible that God set the stars in their courses and controlled the evolution of a habitable world, not ultimately for man's sake but for the sake of His own external glory, a glory which is ever more fully realized through man's constantly growing recognition of the

wonders of creation.¹⁰ And if that is anthropomorphism, I should like to meet the man whose form it reflects.¹¹

But now let us look at the other side of the picture. The most thoughtful attack on religion has come from Mr. J. D. Bernal in the columns of *The Spectator* (Oct. 18th). He boldly entitles his article "Irreligion," and in that article he tries to justify a positive rejection of faith. Far from being a "lovers' quarrel," for him the conflict between science and religion is a war to the death. "The present supposed reconciliation of science and religion is nothing but an attempt to persuade those who wish to be persuaded that the process of intellectualization of the fundamental concepts of science—forgetful of Occam's razor—will incorporate any or all the varieties of thinking that go under the name of religion." Again, "The scientific apologists of religion, mostly mathematicians and physicists, usually forget the increasingly damaging historical and psychological criticism to which it is being subjected." He then rebukes "the Church" for having lost its lead in civilizing influence, but "we must except the Catholic Church, which is rapidly becoming the only effective moral safeguard of capitalistic reaction." Personal religion has taken the place of corporate religion, and it is but a means of escape. Nowadays "morals—as miracles before them—afford a far better reason for rejecting Christianity than for retaining it." It fails to deal with the social and economic needs of the times. "In personal morality, especially in sexual matters, Christianity appears in the light of modern knowledge to be definitely perverted, and to be responsible for multitudes of miserable and distorted lives." Its hampering dogmas cripple the development of ideal education.

Professor Alexander in the lecture to which I have already alluded spoke of the attitude of tolerance of religion which is growing up among scientists, and that, he

¹⁰ Cp. "An Outline of Catholic Teaching," by Rev. George D. Smith, Treasury of the Faith Series, pp. 12, 13.

¹¹ In this attempt to summarize the views of those who according to their various lights have spoken in favour of religion of some sort, I have for obvious reasons made no mention of the only scientist on the B.B.C. platform who spoke with the full illumination of Catholic faith and whose statements of the issue between science and religion has met with almost universal approval, Fr. O'Hara, S.J.

said, was insufficient; science not only tolerates, it demands religion. Mr. Bernal considers that the true scientific spirit rejects religion; but that is not enough: Unfaith must be established on the vacant throne.

Unfortunately, unfaith, dogmatic though it be (as Canon N. P. Williams easily showed), lacks the precision which distinguished its predecessor. "This spirit of unfaith cannot be defined, but some elements of it are clear." The scientific spirit has banished fear, dissipated illusion, and is building up a rational experimental code of morals to take the place of the conventional code which finds no sanction but in tradition. A new loyalty is appearing, a loyalty which supersedes all the old loyalties to friend, family, country: it is loyalty which binds men in unfaith. And the model is Russia! But the final sanction of all this is precisely the same as that of the "scientific apologists of religion" whose witness we have been hearing, "one's own incommunicable experience."

Mr. Bernal's is a typical, though unusually clear and definite, example of the attacks that are being made on religion to-day. They are based on psychological and sociological grounds. Such an attack demands less thought than the metaphysical attempt to riddle free will, miracles, and the argument from design; hence, bowing to the mathematicians (a gesture in which gratitude mingles with grace) the modern descendants of Haeckel and Huxley abandon the old position for the new.

The two chief dogmas about which the storm rages are those of God and Immortality. Professor Huxley wants a religion without God. Professor Bronislaw Malinowski writes: "Though I am unable to worship any divinity, I have almost come to worship, certainly to revere religion."¹² Professor Alexander, as we have seen, expects men, led by their instinct for the "numinous," to worship a God who is not yet, but who will be, the goal of a human "nissus," a product of some sort of "emergent evolution."

Sir Arthur Keith, in a paper published in the *Rationalist Annual*, 1931, assures his readers that there is no life after death. Mr. H. G. Wells, in *The Sunday Express*, claimed immortality for the species while rejecting it for the individual—and Mr. James Douglas roundly asked him what he was talking about. Professor Malin-

¹² *Listener*, Oct. 29th.

owski, again, wants above all things "the answer to the burning questions: 'Am I going to live, or shall I vanish like a bubble?' 'What is the aim, the sense, and the issue of all this strife and suffering?'"

Inquietum est cor nostrum: there is a craving for religion among men who for one reason or another have rejected Christianity and who have to fall back on the wildest and most fantastic systems in the attempt to find that rest which can only be found in God.

Why will they not have the God of revelation? The scientific spirit has made them sceptical and naturalistic. It is their own confession. "Science has spoiled for us the unquestioning acceptance of truth at second-hand—the truth of tradition or of the gospels."¹³ They imagine that the new psychology explains—and by explaining explains away—the evolution of the truths of religion. Professor Malinowski puts briefly and well the position which others have expounded in many pages of writing, sometimes offensive and always shallow: "The comparative science of religion shows, moreover, that the same eternal cravings of the human soul have been satisfied by a variety of obvious fictions, which have worked as well as the nobler religious truths of our own culture. Thus the realities of religious belief, however highly we may place their value, appear almost as instruments created for a special need."¹⁴

With God and immortality is bound up in their mind the influence of fear. Science is supposed to have conferred an inestimable benefit on humanity by banishing this ignoble dread of consequences. Even clerical defenders of religion, forgetful of that text, which they should have remembered from their early attempts at Greek sentences, if not from their Bible, seem eager only to claim for religion an equal easement. This watering down of the concept of God as sovereign majesty and awful justice is not the way to win to religion those whose "creatureliness" is more evident than their "adoption as sons."

Finally, they reject the sense of sin. "To dismiss agnosticism as an easy and shallow escape from the moral obligations and discipline of religion — this is an

¹³ *Listener*, Oct. 29th.

¹⁴ *Ib.*

unworthy and superficial way of dealing with it."¹⁵ We need not do that, but we cannot but observe that there is a rebellion against the imputation of moral guilt to certain actions condemned by the Christian code but demanded in the name of "freedom," of "happiness," of "scientific advance" by almost every one of those who have formally attacked religion in these recent days. And here again representatives of the Church of England have protested against the unfairness of such an assault in view of the Lambeth Letter. "He who is not with me is against me, and he who gathereth not with me scattereth." Not by such trimming will Christianity be saved in our land. And, in all fairness be it said, that representative Anglicans have not hesitated to proclaim that truth and to denounce what they consider to have been a betrayal of Christian principles.

Between Religion and Science there is no quarrel. Both are lovers of the truth, seeking or possessing, and they must love each other. But the scientific spirit may easily be, and often is, opposed to religion. For unless a man's heart is possessed by religion the devotion to science is apt to make him proud, overbearing, contemptuous of that faith whose intellectual basis he has never taken the trouble to investigate. It should not be so, but too often it is. Moreover, the provisional conclusions of science are frequently in conflict, real or apparent, with the definitive truths of theology or philosophy. When that happens the Church, while taking all necessary precautions to shield her children from error, calmly awaits the conciliating developments such as those which have recently shattered determinism. There is but one ultimate truth, and it will admit of no conflict. But the religion that can afford to wait must be dogmatic, downright and uncompromising. It can be no party to a "lovers' quarrel," now yielding, now exacting; at one time fuming, and again relenting; fretting under neglect or contempt, warmed and encouraged by momentary reconciliation. And so once again even as I write we hear the voice from the throne of the Fisherman denouncing in unmistakable terms those corrupt practices which, as we have seen, are demanded by the professed enemies of religion in the name of the advances of modern science.

HOMILETICS

BY THE RT. REV. MGR. DEAN, D.D., Ph.D.,
President of Upholland College.

Septuagesima Sunday.

The Epistle. (1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 5.)

The words¹ that follow close upon this extract—"Let him that thinketh to stand look to it lest he fall"—provide the preacher with both his "text" and the key to the interpretation of to-day's epistle, wherein St. Paul exhorts his Corinthian converts to sustained effort in the struggle for life everlasting, and warns them against over-confidence of ultimate victory.

For inspiration and illustration St. Paul takes his hearers to the Grecian "stadium" or racecourse. Among the most famous was the stadium on the Isthmus of Corinth, not far from the city, and the scene of the triennial Isthmian games that were the delight and pride of all Corinthians. They knew well that *they who run in the race all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize*; not that few could ever win, but that none could ever win without real endeavour. *So run ye as to make it yours. Now every competitor restraineth himself in all things* calculated to lead to defeat; they were bound to spend at least ten months in training; *and they, indeed, to receive after all but a perishable crown, a mere chaplet of withering pine leaves, but we an imperishable one*, "the unfading garland of glory."² *I therefore run—adds the Apostle—yet not aimlessly, "not anyhow and at random,"* comments St. John Chrysostom; *I fight—continues St. Paul, not as beating the air, not wildly and impotently, but as a boxer who deals well-directed, vigorous blows; I bruise my body, subduing "the flesh with its passions and desires,"³ and bring it into bondage—even as the victorious combatant often led his vanquished opponent, slave-like, round the arena: lest haply, concludes St. Paul—playing on the verb "to herald" which had come to mean also "to preach," and alluding to the herald who summoned the contending athletes and had a chief part in the conduct of the games—lest haply after being herald to others I myself become disqualified, be found unworthy of the one prize worth winning.*

Here the great herald of Christ sounds the note of fear and warning: "Let him that thinketh to stand look to it lest he fall"; and he bids them be mindful of the fate of the Israelites in the arena of the desert. *For I would not have you ignorant,*

¹ The text of the *Westminster Version* has been followed throughout the present article.

² 1 Pet. v. 4.

³ Gal. v. 24.

brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, that mysterious "pillar of cloud" wherein "the Lord went before them" day and night throughout their wanderings;⁴ and all passed through the Red Sea, while "the waters were to them as a wall on their right hand and on their left";⁵ and as we have sealed our allegiance unto Christ in baptism, so all they were baptized unto the following of Moses by a mystical baptism in the cloud, the symbol of the presence of the Holy Spirit, and in the Sea;⁶ and as we all "eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood," so all they ate the same spiritual food, the Heaven-sent manna, figure of "the living bread come down from Heaven," and all drank the same spiritual drink, the miraculous water which God brought forth from the desert rock.⁷

Thus favoured were "our fathers," yet they fell. At this point the Apostle might well have brought his warning to a close with his simple statement: *yet with the most of them God was not well pleased.* (In actual fact, of the Hebrews who went out of Egypt, all except two, Caleb and Josue, perished in the desert.) But this mighty herald, to whom Christ had been revealed as "all and in all,"⁸ could not forbear to add here, albeit parenthetically, that his beloved Christ *was the rock*; and that even those Israelites in the desert *drank from this spiritual rock which followed them*—accompanied them everywhere; it was even Christ's protecting presence that was ever with them. The Jewish Christians at least would readily grasp St. Paul's meaning. Christ was God, and "Rock" was one of the names of God (though seldom so rendered in St. Jerome's version), and thus to the Apostle the smitten rock was as the pierced side of Christ already exercising His office of Saviour of the world.

Sexagesima Sunday.

The Epistle. (II Cor. xi. 19—xii. 9.)

St. Paul is not sounding a trumpet before him that he may be honoured by men, but is letting his light shine before men that they may glorify God. His one concern is to vindicate his apostleship. Paul was in very truth "an apostle, sent not by any man but by Jesus Christ."⁹ That dignity he dare not, could not, forego. Into his well-loved church of Corinth, there had entered "crafty workers," "ministers of Satan,"¹⁰ who sought to undermine the apostle's authority and to alienate the sheep from their shepherd—even as to-day men deride the Vicar of Christ and seek to turn the children against

⁴ Exod. xiii. 21-22.

⁵ Exod. xiv. 29.

⁶ cf John iii 5.

⁷ Exod. xvii. 6; Num. xx. 2-11.

⁸ Col. iii. 11.

⁹ Gal. i. 1.

¹⁰ II Cor. xi. 13.

their Father—and Paul leapt up in defence of his divine commission and of the souls committed to his charge; and, on fire with zeal and indignation, “jealous with a jealousy divine,”¹¹ he penned this the most impassioned and intensely personal of all his epistles, an outpouring of hope and fear, of tender affection and terrible invective.

To-day’s lesson opens with irony, and the lash falls first on those Corinthians who had listened to St. Paul’s domineering detractors and so had driven him to write in commendation of himself. Self-glorification is “foolishness” and the act of a “fool,” yet he proposes to turn “foolish” and to “boast a little”: *For ye suffer fools gladly, being wise yourselves!* Indeed, in your “wisdom” you appear to appreciate bullying, extortion, and browbeating! *For ye suffer it if any man enslave you, devour you, prey upon you, is arrogant, strike you in the face!* St. Paul is alluding to the conduct of his opponents, and apologises with biting irony for having shown himself backward in this sort of thing. *I speak to my own dishonour, as though we had shown ourselves weak in this regard!*

With this introduction St. Paul turns to the more delicate task of dealing with the disparaging comparison which his enemies had somehow set up between his own apostolate and that of the other apostles, “the Twelve.” Twice¹² does he feel it necessary to urge in his defence that he has “in no way fallen short of the most eminent apostles”—referring doubtless to Peter, James and John. But now he puts aside all irony; he breathes never a word against any one of “the Twelve”: yet firmly and frankly he declines to admit the inferiority in any way of his own apostolate. *They are Hebrews?—Israelites?—The seed of Abraham? So am I! They are ministers of Christ? I—I speak as one beside himself—I am more: and thus the apostle is led to draw up for us the well-known record of his labours and sufferings and many perils in the service of Christ. Truly, he had “laboured more than all of them!”¹³ And besides all else, that which presseth on me daily, my anxiety for all the churches!*

And he, too, had followed in the footsteps of the Master. *Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I am not on fire?*—even as at that moment he was on fire with indignation against the tempters of his flock.

But, after all, are not these things evidence not of power and greatness but of weakness and infirmity? Be it so! *If boast I must, I will boast of mine infirmity!* At any rate, I have told the truth. *God, blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not!* Indeed, I recall that my apostolate began “in infirmity,” with a flight from my first foes in Damascus.

¹¹ II Cor. xi. 2.

¹² II Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11.

¹³ I Cor. xv. 10.

From the enumeration of his sufferings for Christ, St. Paul comes "to the visions and revelations of the Lord," soaring from the furrows of human infirmity to the sublime sphere of things divine. If "the most eminent apostles" had their Thabor and heard "a voice from the cloud," "the least of the apostles" likewise had been *a man who was rapt to the third heaven, rapt to Paradise—whether in the body or out of the body, God knoweth—and heard utterances unutterable. Of this same man, of a Paul gloriously and gratuitously honoured of God, I will boast, but of myself, my own poor person, I will not boast save of mine infirmities!* Not that there is naught else whereof to boast. *For if I shall wish to boast, I shall not be foolish; for I shall be speaking the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me beyond what he seeth in me or heareth of me.* I am prepared to stand or fall by my known conduct and preaching.

And now we are given a last look into the soul of this great saint. It reveals a very personal secret and not a little of the divine purpose of suffering. The only parallel passage in scripture is the account of our Lord's own agony. Paul, too, had his Gethsemane. *Lest I should be lifted up overmuch by the grandeur of these revelations, there was given me a thorn in my flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me.* What was this sharp reminder of his weakness and nothingness? Persecution? Ill-health? Rebellion of the flesh? No man knoweth. It was something humiliating, almost beyond endurance, and as his divine Master in agony had thrice appealed to His Father, so Paul cried to Jesus to let the cup pass away from him: *About this thrice did I beseech the Lord that it might depart from me. And He hath said to me: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for strength is made perfect in infirmity."* Divine paradox! The supernatural strength imparted by grace is made perfect—is seen in its greatest perfection—in infirmity. When the human instrument is weak, then has the sustaining power of God fuller scope and greatest evidence. Thus is God glorified in human weakness. *Most gladly, then, will I rather boast of mine infirmities, that so there may rest upon me the strength of Christ.* Self-sufficiency repels Him; the acknowledgement of need draws Him. "The Lord resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."¹⁴

Lessons: 1. Loyalty to our bishops, the successors of the apostles, "whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God."¹⁵ St. Paul's invective was levelled at those catholics who had listened to men who sought to belittle his apostolic authority.

2. Love of God and of souls: a willingness to suffer much and to sacrifice all in the cause of Christ.

3. Humility: "What hast thou which thou hast not

¹⁴ Prov. iii. 34.

¹⁵ Acts xx. 28.

received? And if thou hast received it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?"¹⁶

4. Resignation under affliction: "Strength is made perfect in infirmity."

Quinquagesima Sunday.

The Epistle. (I Cor. xiii. 1-13.)

In the whole range of inspired writing there is no grander panegyric upon charity than this of St. Paul, himself so perfect a lover of God and man. The charity here eulogized is that "charity of God (which) is poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who hath been given to us,"¹⁷ the queen of the three theological virtues. If not identical with, it is at least inseparable from, the all-necessary gift of sanctifying grace, that "wedding-garment" without which no man may enter the bridal-hall of Heaven. Linked with faith and hope the very name "charity" is consecrate; it carries no evil implication. We may speak of a passionate, selfish, impure *love*, but hardly of a passionate, selfish, impure *charity*. It connotes the highest kind of love, and, in the language of the Church, the highest kind of *supernatural* love. By it not only does our heart almost instinctively go out to God as good (*amor*), not only do we single Him out from and prefer Him to every other good (*dilectio*), but, furthermore, we do so from the highest of motives; we appreciate and prize Him *for His own sake*, His own infinite worth and excellence and loveableness. We hold Him dear (*carus*) on that account, yea, most dear.

With such a love are we called upon to love God; for, as by the infusion of sanctifying grace we have "become partakers of the divine nature" and are raised to the status of "sons of God," we owe Him a love such as corresponds to this new and wonderful relationship. God is our Father, to be loved now not out of fear, nor just for what we may get from Him, but for His own loveable Self's sake. Precisely, that we may live up to our position of "sons of God," He has given us the virtue of charity—that "supernatural gift of God by which we love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves, *for God's sake*."

In to-day's epistle St. Paul expounds the excellence and pre-eminence of charity, by the elaboration of three great truths:

1. Whatever other gift a man may have, if he have not charity "it profiteth him nothing." He had just been writing of these other gifts—extraordinary *charismata* or manifestations of the Holy Spirit, *gratiae gratis datae*, much coveted by the Corinthians and far more common in the infancy of the Church than now, but which did not of themselves make their possessors pleasing to God. They were not *gratiae gratum facientes*. Such was the gift of "tongues"—of speaking in a strange language; such, too, the gift of "prophecy"—of

¹⁶ I Cor. iv. 7.

¹⁷ Rom. v. 6.

speaking under special inspiration; such, the gift of a preternatural "knowledge"; and such, the gift of a miracle-working "faith" (here a *charisma*, not the theological virtue of that name). But St. Paul sweeps these aside in favour of "a way that surpasseth all." *If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or clanging cymbal.*

2. Where charity reigns, there, too—a noble retinue—are all the other virtues. The queen never enters without her attendant suite. Grace and charity and all the moral virtues come together and go together. Even faith and hope cannot "live" without charity. This truth St. Paul expresses in a passage of poetic beauty and measure. Charity, as befits the queen of virtues, is personified, and is portrayed not simply as dwelling in the soul, but as operative through all the virtues which abide with her and which it is her privilege and her right to command, for she is the mother and mistress of them all. *Charity is patient, is kind; charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely, is not puffed up, is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked, regardeth not evil; rejoiceth not over wickedness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.*

3. "Charity faileth never." Perfect charity is the very perfection of man here and hereafter. Yea, the virtue of charity by which in this life we love God above all things for His own sake is the very same whereby we shall love Him in Heaven. only with an activity intensified, irresistible and indefectible. The much prized *charismata* of "prophecy," "tongues," and "knowledge" are not the permanent foundation of the Christian life. They are of their nature transient activities, unessential to the soul, earth-bound and imperfect; and "when the perfection is come" they shall pass away as all the imperfections of this life; even as manhood and maturity shed the ways of childhood and immaturity; as perfect vision supersedes all dimly mirrored reflections of the truth. Even faith and hope shall then be no more, for faith is of things not seen and hope is of joys not yet possessed. But *Charity faileth never: whereas prophesyings, they shall have an end; tongues, they shall cease; knowledge, it shall have an end. For we know in part, and we prophecy in part; however gifted and illumined our minds may be, our knowledge and vision here remain partial and imperfect—"for we walk by faith, not by sight";¹⁸ but when the perfect is come, what is in part shall have an end. To exemplify: When I was a child, I spoke—felt—thought—as a child; now that I am become a man, I have made an end of childish ways. Now we see in a mirror, obscurely,¹⁹ we get but dim and blurred reflections of the truth; but then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known. But, meanwhile, to save my soul I must worship God by faith, hope, and charity.*

¹⁸ II Cor. v. 7.

¹⁹ As in the old metallic mirrors.

*First Sunday in Lent.**The Epistle. (II Cor. vi. 1-10.)*

The first seven chapters of II Corinthians are apologetic in character. St. Paul is at pains to explain his conduct and his motives, and to uphold the grandeur of the Christian ministry and apostolic office. In to-day's reading he shows how he himself endeavoured to live up to its standard, and he pleads for a similar earnestness on the part of his readers. We apostles, he wrote, "are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting through us."²⁰ Therefore, *as God's fellow-workers we exhort you not to receive the grace of God in vain. (For He saith, addressing the Messiah and in Him all His people, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee.*²¹ Behold, adds the apostle, mindful that the fulness of time was come and the new era of grace inaugurated, *now is the truly acceptable time, behold, now is the day of salvation!)*

From this point onwards, St. Paul, in language of rare beauty, tells how he and his fellow-apostles have exercised their apostolate. (Unfortunately, our defective Vulgate rendering of verse 4—*exhibeamus nosmetipsos sicut Dei ministros*—has converted into an exhortation what is really simple narrative.) *We give no offence in aught, that so the ministry be not blamed. But in everything we commend ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience. And he maps out the vast field of patience: in tribulations, in hardships, in straits; in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults; in labours, in watchings, in fastings. And as "in much patience," so too in other virtues and gifts: in chastity, in knowledge of "the deep things of God," in long-suffering, in goodness, in the Holy Spirit, in charity unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God. The very weapons of our warfare commend us: the armour of justness on the right hand and on the left—"the sword of the spirit" for attack, "the shield of faith" for defence;²² in glory and dishonour, in evil report and good report. Indeed, we are the world's enigma, at once manifest and mysterious, baffling and alluring: as deceivers and yet truthful, as unknown and yet well known, as dying and behold we live, as chastised and yet not done to death, as mourning yet ever rejoicing, as poor yet enriching many, as having naught yet possessing all things.*

So spoke St. Paul in defence of his own apostolate. So too might speak the many good priests and monks and nuns whose "life is hidden with Christ in God." So also, and above all, office still abides in all its fulness. Almost every word of the "epistle" might well be penned by the Holy Father to-day in his own exalted name. As revealing the life of the Church herself throughout the ages, every syllable rings as true to-day as in St. Paul's own time.

²⁰ II Cor. v. 20.

²¹ Isai. xlix. 8.

²² Eph. vi. 16.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

BY THE REV. LAURENCE P. EMERY, M.A.

IN the Linzer *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, 1930 (pp. 59-79; 285-306; 497-523; 701-722) Dr. Joseph Grosam treats very fully the question of the lawfulness of sterilization whether by private authority, or on the authority of the State. In discussing the competency of the State to legalise sterilization in certain cases, he differs from the conclusion arrived at by Dr. Joseph Mayer in his work *Gesetzliche Unfruchtbarmachung Geisteskranker*. This question has been the subject of much discussion of recent years in both the Catholic and non-Catholic press. Generally it has been discussed from the point of view of the competency of the State to enforce sterilization. But apart from this aspect, there are other questions in connection with sterilization that interest the theologian. In the first two parts of his article, Dr. Grosam treats of the nature of the various operations that are performed in order to procure sterilization, and the lawfulness of such operations. In the third part he discusses the sinfulness of sterilization, the sinfulness of co-operating in such operations, the lawfulness of the conjugal act in the case where one of the partners has undergone any one of these operations, and the question whether sterilization induces impotency. The last question with which he deals is one to which, as he states, little attention has hitherto been paid. If a married person sinfully procures sterilization without the knowledge of, or against the will of the other partner, has that other partner therein a cause for separation *a mensa et toro*? He points out that this is not mentioned among the causes of perpetual separation that are laid down in the Code, Can. 1129-1131; but if a single act of adultery gives the injured party the right to perpetual separation, it would seem that the sinful procurement of sterilization, which is a serious crime against the primary end of marriage, viz., human propagation, and against the other partner—a crime, too, that is as a rule of lasting consequence—should likewise be a cause for perpetual separation. That it is such, cannot be stated with certainty. The author thinks, however, that if sterilization were considered a cause for temporary separation, this could more easily be reconciled with the Code, since Can. 1131 in enumerating the causes of temporary separation adds the words:—“*Hæc aliaque id genus sunt pro altero conjuge totidem legitimæ causæ discedendi.*” But even this, he adds, is doubtful, and needs further discussion.

An Examination of Eugenics, by H. Robbins,¹ is a useful and opportune little book on a subject about which the clergy are not

¹ Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 118, 1/-.

infrequently called upon to express an opinion. After a chapter on the "Name and the Thing," the writer discusses our present-day knowledge of heredity, because:—"Scientifically, eugenics stands or falls by the proof of the proposition that it is possible to forecast with certainty the incidence of hereditary qualities and taints. Morally and socially, its discussion *begins* when the possibility of such forecasting is placed before us as a scientific fact." (P. 9.) He shows that at present our knowledge of heredity is far too uncertain to allow its being used as a starting point for eugenic methods; moreover, he shows that the eugenist claim is not endorsed by Biologists. A point to be noted is the statement at the beginning of this chapter, viz., "The greatest emphasis must be laid on the radical difference between a statement of apparent hereditary transmission after it has happened, and the ability to *forecast* that transmission with certainty, for the point has been largely obscured in the dust of conflict." In the chapter on Mental Deficiency the inadequacy of the definitions of a mental defective, as contained in the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, is pointed out. The criticism of the *Wood Report* of 1929 is particularly illuminating, showing, as it does, the unsound prepossessions and assumptions brought out by the Report. In the fourth chapter on the eugenic expedients, viz., prohibition of marriage, segregation, sterilization and the lethal chamber, the writer shows that they are all indefensible on eugenic grounds. "The remedy for the State Problem of Mental Deficiency is the restoration of Social Justice, enabling the Family to fulfil its functions of maintenance and protection." The book will be found useful, and will repay careful study, even though one may not altogether agree with every statement of the writer.

Moral Theology: A Complete Course, by Frs. McHugh and Callan, O.P. (Herder, 2 vols., 20s. each), will be the more welcome to English clergy, because works on Moral Theology in English are not very abundant. This work, of which the first volume has appeared, is a fully up-to-date work on the subject. The authors basing their work on the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and the best modern authorities, intend to offer a work that is above all practical, wherein one can easily find the application of principles to present-day problems. The order followed is that of St. Thomas in the second part of his *Summa*. Particular attention is paid to the clear and concise statement of principles; controverted points that interest the specialist rather than the busy priest on the mission are as far as possible left aside. A particular feature of the work is the abundant use of examples to illustrate the principles laid down. Another aspect of the work is set forth in the words of the authors:—"It would be a mistake to think that Moral Theology deals exclusively or primarily with vice and sin, and that it is intended only to enable the priest rightly to administer the Sacrament of Penance. . . . The subject is indeed more positive than negative, and it should be discussed accordingly. Thus, far from being useful merely to

confessors as a guide by which they may detect and distinguish mortal and venial sins and the higher and lower degrees of culpability, Moral Theology in its broader aspect should be of the greatest service likewise to the individual in forming his own habits and character . . . the present work has been written with a view to the homiletic and pastoral functions of the priest, as well as those that pertain strictly to the administration of the sacraments." The style is pleasing, and the book eminently practical.

In the domain of Canon Law several interesting books have appeared during the past twelve months, but it seems more useful to note some of the more important decrees connected with canon law that have lately appeared.

Canon 845, § 2. *An Diaconus, sacram Communionem ad normam canonis 845, § 2, ministrans, possit et debeat in fine ritus benedictionem manu impertire juxta Rituale romanum, tit. IV, cap. II, n. 10. R. Affirmative.* The Roman Ritual in the place referred to, distinctly states that a deacon in administering Holy Communion must observe the same Rite as the priest, and therefore an authentic decision on the question that was submitted to the Commission might seem superfluous. But since Can. 1147, § 4, allows deacons to impart lawfully and validly those blessings alone that are *expressly* allowed them by law, and the deacon is *expressly* allowed to give only the blessing with the ciborium at the end of the rite for Communion of the sick, some authors taught (e.g. Cappello De Sacram I, n. 454) that a deacon may not give the blessing with his hand after giving Holy Communion. The present decree, however, decides that he may and must give the blessing with his hand after giving Holy Communion. (A.A.S. XXII, p. 365.)

Canon 1363. *An filii legitimati per subsequens parentum matrimonium habendi sint uti legitimi ad effectum, de quo in canone 1363, § 1. R. Affirmative.* The canon quoted says only legitimate children are to be admitted into seminaries; it does not expressly exclude those who have been legitimised, and since legitimised children, according to can. 1117, are to be considered in the same category as legitimate children in regard to canonical effects, unless expressly excluded (as in can. 232, § 2, n.1.) they may be admitted into seminaries. (A.A.S. XXII, p. 365.)

Canon 1099, § 2. According to the second part of this paragraph, children born of non-catholic parents (*ab acatholicis nati*), even though they have been baptized catholics, are not bound by the ecclesiastical form laid down in can. 1094, if they contract marriage with a non-catholic, and provided that they themselves have grown up from infancy in heresy, schism, paganism, or without any religion at all. Authors disputed whether the clause *ab acatholicis nati* would be verified if only one of the parents was a non-catholic, as in the case of a mixed marriage. The Commission for the Interpretation of the Code (C.I.C.) in a reply of the 20th July, 1929, replied in the affirmative. (Cf. A.A.S. XXI, p. 573.)

A further question was submitted to the Commission for solution, viz.: *An sub verbis "ab acatholicis nati," de quibus in can. 1099, § 2, comprehendantur etiam nati ab apostatis*, and the reply was again in the affirmative. (C.I.C., 17th Feb., 1930. A.A.S. XXII. p. 195.) Children therefore of apostate parents are to be considered, for the effect of this canon, in the same category as children born of non-catholic parents. Apostates, according to can. 1325, § 2, are those who after baptism have totally receded from the Christian faith. Fr. Vermeersch, commenting on this reply in *Periodica* tom. XIX, p. 268, says that the term apostate is not to be taken only in its strict significance, but also in the broader sense of those who have defected from the catholic faith which they had professed.

Canon 1513, § 2. The canon lays down that if the civil formalities requisite for the validity of a will are omitted in any will that is in favour of ecclesiastical purposes, the heirs must be warned (*moneantur*) to fulfil the testator's wishes. Before the appearance of the Code, practically all theologians and canonists held that a will in favour of ecclesiastical purposes, even though invalid in civil law owing to the lack of requisite formalities, was still binding in conscience on the heirs. D'Annibale alone did not support this opinion. Since the Code doubt as to the certainty of this opinion has arisen from the use of the word "*moneantur*" in this canon. Fr. Prummer in his moral theology (vol. 2, § 277) calls the opinion that denies the obligation a probable one, and quoting this canon adds: *Quare saltem postquam Codex jur. eccl. vim obtinuit, jam non videtur adesse stricta obligatio iustitiae observandi informe testamentum ad causas pias, quod irritum declaratum est a lege civili.* But if the word "*moneantur*" does not imply the existence of an obligation on the part of the heirs, why should they be advised to carry out the will? That it actually does imply such an obligation has now been settled by a decision of the C.I.C. *Utrum verbum "moneantur," de quo in canone 1513, § 2, sit praeceptivum an tantum exhortativum. R. Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam.* (17th February, 1930. A.A.S. XXII, p. 196.) Previous to this decision the question had been discussed by Frs. Cappello and Vermeersch in *Periodica* tom. XIX, pp. 40-42; 49-63.

Canon 1971, § 1, n.1. According to this canon the party to an invalid marriage is not allowed to apply for a declaration of nullity or a separation, if he or she was the cause of the impediment that gave rise to the invalidity of the marriage. The C.I.C., in a reply of the 12th March, 1929 (A.A.S. XXI, p. 171), stated that word *impedimentum* was to be understood not only of impediments strictly so-called, but also of those other causes of invalidity included under canons 1081-1103, viz., cases where the invalidity arises from some defect in the consent or in the ecclesiastical form. The question therefore arose whether such parties had any means of bringing forward the nullity of their marriage; this has been settled by a further

reply: *An conjuges qui, juxta canonem 1971, ¶1, n.I, et interpretationem diei 12 Martii, 1929, habiles non sunt ad accusandum matrimonium, vi ejusdem canonis ¶2 jus saltem habeant nullitatem matrimonii Ordinario vel promotori justitiae denuntiandi. R. Affirmative.* (A.A.S. XXII, p. 196.) The reply makes a distinction between the right to "accuse a marriage," and the right to "denounce" it; whereas such parties may not accuse the marriage, i.e., be promoters of the suit, they have the same power as other people mentioned in § 2 of denouncing the marriage, that is of informing the Ordinary or the Promoter Justitiae of the facts that give rise to the invalidity of the marriage.

II. RECENT WORK IN SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. CHARLES CORBISHLEY, M.A.

In general, one must not expect to find very much, or indeed more than very little, in English from Catholic writers. For that our numbers are too small and our interests too distracted. But in Germany and France and Italy, and perhaps in other countries also, where the larger schools and the universities are partially or entirely in Catholic hands, a large and constant stream of living literature is ever pouring out and spreading over the land. It is the literature of these countries, therefore, that we shall chiefly have to consider.

Introduction Works, with which we must begin, will suggest to many the name of Cornely and his *Compendium Introductionis*, and we must speak first of the latest edition of this work. First published in 1900, as part of the great series, the *Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ*, which the Jesuit Fathers, Hummelauer, Knabenbauer, Cornely and others gave to the world, it has gone through many editions and survived several revisions, especially that undertaken by Fr. Hagen, S.J., in 1909. It was in presentation, perhaps, rather a forbidding book, but in our judgment it was a thoroughly competent and complete introduction, and it is evidence of its vitality that now, when through the ever accumulating additions to our knowledge and to our difficulties it has become rather outmoded and insufficient, it has not been thrown on to the dust heap, but has been retained in its essential form, though with many additions and alterations.

These are embodied in its tenth edition, the work of Fr. Merk, S.J. (*Introductionis in S. Scripturæ Libros Compendium*. Lethielleux, Paris, 1929). He has brought it completely up to date and abreast of recent literature and recent problems. In the process it has lost, it seems to us, something of its simplicity and of its usefulness as a text-book for beginners. Its Latin, also, is not of the fine quality of its predecessors, but its scholarship is unmistakeable and its freedom from convention in rejecting views which all previous editions had held is very noticeable and worth exemplifying. Concerning the authorship of Josue, for instance, he will make no definite claim, Job is no longer confi-

dently attributed to the age of Solomon, Ecclesiastes is denied to him, the Canticle of Canticles is left doubtful, the order of the Minor Prophets is not fixed with any assurance.

He accepts, of course, completely and loyally the decrees of the Biblical Commission, but he is careful to indicate the freedom which they leave when rightly interpreted. In sum, the work shows the present position of Catholic doctrine and opinion as completely and as authoritatively as one could wish.

A work of a rather similar kind is being brought out by the Biblical Institute in Rome: *Institutiones Biblicæ scholis accommodatæ*.

In Germany, where an enormous amount of work is done on the Old Testament and where the difficulties which ruthless modern criticism has raised are felt acutely as perhaps nowhere else, a learned and yet restrained and attractive work is the *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* of Professor Goettsberger, of Munich University (Herder, Freiburg, 1929). He can deal with modern criticism with competence yet without heat or rancour, or foolish contempt. Generally his conclusions are similar to those of Cornely-Merk.

Coming to separate commentaries, we are able to give a sincere and warm welcome to *The Psalms Explained, for Priests and Students*, by the Rev. C. J. Callan, O.P., and J. McHugh, O.P. (Wagner, New York; Herder, London, 524 pp. 18s. net.) Though excellent commentaries on the Psalms have been given to us in English in recent years, we think that this can still claim to satisfy a want, limiting its explanatory matter to the minimum and presenting it all in one well-printed readable volume. The page has two columns, one giving the Latin text, the other an excellent paraphrase, which makes the strangest phrases seem reasonable. Who has not wondered at the multitudinous obscurities of the Latin text, at the strange abruptness, for instance, of the line in the Sunday Psalm, *parata sedes tua ex tunc*, or elsewhere at the mysterious *cucurri in siti*, or at scores of other words and passages; Here a word is added or a phrase modified, and the meaning appears as if out of nothing.

In Biblical Archaeology a new fascinating world is being opened up in Mesopotamia and other Eastern lands. Of the mass of literature on this subject, one or two English works may be mentioned: *Ur Excavations*, Vol. I, by Hall and Woolley (Oxford University Press); *The Early History of Assyria*, by Sidney Smith (Chatto & Windus); *The Hittite Empire*, by Prof. Garstang, 1929 (Constable, London).

Finally, before passing to the New Testament literature, we may be allowed a lament at the recent death of a great scholar, the Rev. Fr. Kugler, S.J. His labours on the dates and chronology of the Old Testament brought long-sought solutions which are being universally accepted, and all scholars regret his premature death.

New Testament literature shows questions still alive which

most of us probably regarded as long ago disposed of. The historical existence of our Lord, for instance, denied some years ago in Holland and Germany, is now again dealt with and settled in a French work of fine quality: *Le Christ Jésus* (411 pp.: Paris, Bloud et Gay). Another and a larger and more actual question is that of the origin and credibility of the New Testament writings. The Rev. J. Huby presents the Catholic case simply and yet fully and efficiently in *L'Evangile et les Evangiles* (306 pp.: Paris, B. Grasset, in the collection, *La Vie Chrétienne*).

St. Paul, himself so passionately believing and hating unbelief, remains at once the fascination and the problem of Protestant theology. Is he the villain of the piece or the hero? Did he establish true Christianity or did he distort the original truth out of all recognition? Protestantism began by claiming him as the champion who would destroy Peter's supremacy, and perchance orthodox Protestantism still maintains that hope or belief, but liberal Protestantism has claimed now for many years that the historical theology of Christianity and Catholicism originated in the mind of St. Paul and was foisted on to the true original Christianity of Christ, which it overwhelmed and absorbed; that an impassible chaos is fixed between Christ and Paul which can never be bridged. It was clear, however, that this attitude satisfied neither the facts of the rise of the Church nor of the personal history of the Apostle.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the question has been examined again by the critics themselves and the results of a recent work by Professor Paul Feine (*Der Apostel Paulus*. Bertelsmann Gütersloh, 1927. 630 pp.) seem to be worth recording here. He begins with a survey of the whole history of the interpretation of the Apostle and distinguishes four different classes of critics who have each claimed to possess the key to the understanding of the Apostle's personality. First comes the intellectual and doctrinal approach which sees in the Apostle primarily a fount of doctrine and of truths of faith. To such a class of interpretation belonged Luther and the first Reformers, and now again a large number of German Protestants, Harnack amongst them. For these the Apostle is primarily a dogmatic text book. The second school is that of the history of religions which seeks the origin of his thought in almost every variety of pagan religion known to the world up till then. The latest specimen favoured is one which grew on the banks of the Tigris, the Mandeian sect.

The third class is that of the eschatologists, whose essential principle is that everything of the Apostle's thought was based on the expectation of a world-end and world-judgment which was fast approaching, and that it must be interpreted accordingly. Finally the mode of interpretation which Feine himself and others favour: the Apostle, they say, must be viewed not as a doctrinal machine but as a living personal being whose object was life rather than thought, religion rather than theology; his writings follow the same purpose, to fire and exhort rather than to teach, and though, of course, they contain doctrine, they are

not doctrinal treatises and furnish no complete presentation of the doctrine the Apostle held.

How this form of approach would work out in practice we have no space here to discuss, but in general we can say that though there is truth in it and especially so in the case of some epistles but much less in others, it seems to us much to exaggerate the opposition between itself and the first view, and to do less than justice to the convinced dogmatism of the Apostle. The shyness of definite doctrine which these critics would attribute to him is really but the reflection of their own desire to avoid definition. From this historical survey the Professor comes to the subject proper of his work, his own search for the truth concerning the great Apostle and the right understanding of him. He divides his enquiry into four chapters: Paul and the first Christian Community, Paul and Jesus, the Christian hope of salvation in the light of the comparative history of religion, and lastly, final deductions for the interpretation of the Apostle's mind. The first chapter, the relation of St. Paul to the first community is the essential subject of the whole book. Did the Apostle form or rather reform the first church or did he arise naturally and without any antagonism out of it? He examines this question once again and his conclusion is the conclusion of Catholic tradition: the Apostle arose from the community, his beliefs were already theirs, he expresses them more fully than other leaders and contributes his learning and his great intellectual powers to their presentation, but there is not, and never was, any essential opposition between him and the other Apostles and teachers to whom he joined himself.

Similarly, as the second chapter shows, there is no opposition between Paul and Christ. The author would even claim acceptance for the view that the Apostle knew Our Lord and had listened to His discourses in Jerusalem, a view which remains unproven and unlikely, but the importance of his conclusions in these two chapters is not to be gainsaid, for no one could well charge this liberal critic with prejudice in favour of tradition.

A third chapter takes up the question as to how far the Christianity of St. Paul was the product of earlier or contemporary religions, and here again the conclusion is very close to what Catholic tradition and teaching has always maintained. The Apostle is completely cleared of the charge of being infected by any pagan religion, though strangely at the expense of His Master in whom traces of Greek thought, of Hellenism, are claimed to be recognizable. Finally, the key doctrine of the Apostle is not Justification, as the Reformers claimed, or the question of the Jewish Law, or even Christology, but the Old Testament doctrine of God, now shown to be revealing Himself through His Son to the world in logical fulfilment of the Old Testament promises.

Such in outline are the contents and conclusions of this important work, and if we have given it much space, it is because it throws light directly or indirectly on the present state of

criticism in regard to St. Paul, whilst it also gives some hope of saner and more reasonable views coming back to general acceptance, for its general conclusions are sane and reasonable even though much of its detail remains unacceptable. Let us cherish the hope and observe the manner of its fulfilment.

III. RECENT WORK IN CHURCH HISTORY.

BY THE VERY REV. C. L. WARING, M.A.

"REGAL fare in luxurious variety" might briefly describe the recent output in Church History. French, English, German, Spanish or Italian—you may have your favourite study in your favourite language, you may have it plain and straightforward, you may have it crusted with references—a veritable vintage of mature scholarship. There are small volumes, medium sized or large—to suit all tastes and conditions, and the periods dealt with are truly catholic.

A little volume which may have a value beyond what the author intended is T. Allison's *English Religious Life in the Eighth Century*. Not that anything new is said about the eighth century or about religious life; indeed, the impression left on most priests will probably be that it is clearly possible to know details without seeing the essentials. The pity is that a Catholic has not done the work. Our debt to Mr. Allison is that he shows us how it may be done. He gives us a valuable list of authorities, and there are many priests whose command of Latin would make it easy for them to read volumes of the *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* in which they will find the Letters of Alcuin and other sources necessary for the work. Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and his *Vita Sancti Cuthberti* are easily accessible, and in all a Catholic will find himself very much at home. The identity of the Church then with the Catholic remnant in England to-day starts out from every page: but Mr. Allison does not stress the point.

How human they were too! The elders even in the eighth century tried to turn the youth of that day to serious reading and serious study. Apparently the juvenile weakness then was "to dig out the holes of foxes and to follow the swift course of hares." "*Qui non discit in pueritia, non docet in senectute*," said the Wise Ones; and no doubt the youngsters laughed.

There were great men in the period—Bede, Boniface, Lullus, Aldhelm, Wilfrid, Benedict Biscop, Alcuin and the less-known Albinus, who had no small knowledge of Greek and was as familiar with Latin as with his own language. When will our Catholic scholars restore their fame?

Mr. Allison notes with approval, perhaps with surprise, how these pre-Reformation Englishmen insist on the reading of the Scriptures; he notes their piety; but it takes a Catholic to feel the tenderness of their reference to Our Lady, their love and reverence for Rome—a favourite goal of their pilgrimages—and for the Holy Father, and the truly Catholic spirit of the age.

Yet this little volume published by the S.P.C.K. deserves to be widely known.

On the later period of English Church History there is a book on *Sant' Anselmo (Vita e Pensiero)* by Arrigo Levasti. It may not be a great contribution to history but it introduces the great post-Conquest trio, Lanfranc, St. Anselm and St. Thomas of Canterbury. These names emphasise what a history we have. At present Mr. Zachary Brooke, the best Cambridge historian of Medieval times, is working on this period, and in due course we shall have some interesting information on the sources of Lanfranc's legislation. It may be as well to mention that those who are not quite so clear as they used to be on just where the False Decretals were false will need to look up the point.

When the Birkbeck Lectures are published there will be some interesting reading on the meaning of *Ecclesia Anglicana*. In this connection everyone ought to know P. Janelle's *Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge University Press). Original documents are always valuable, and in these Gardiner is anxious to consider the ecclesiastical system at home as the Church in England—not the Church of England.

Before leaving this period one must mention an article on St. Thomas of Canterbury written for the John Rylands Library Bulletin by T. F. Tout, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A. Coming from such an authority, it is naturally discerning; but the great value of the article is that it gives a list of all the authorities which need be used for a really satisfactory life of St. Thomas. That is another piece of work for someone.

The ecclesiastical colossus of the sixteenth century is the subject of two works—Mr. Pollard and Mr. Belloc both having produced a book on Wolsey. The volumes suggest a conundrum. When is Biography not History and History not Biography?

Mr. Pollard is a well-known historian, and his book gives documented and detailed information on the political and constitutional history of the times. Wolsey is somewhat out of sight in the earlier chapters, but when he does appear we find him making his way by his amazing energy and efficiency. The old theory that the key to Wolsey's foreign policy is the balance of power does not commend itself to Mr. Pollard. As for Wolsey himself, one of the most significant sayings in the book is this: "It is more certain that he wanted power for itself than that he wanted power to effect a reformation." Few will admire Wolsey more for what is here written of him, but it all helps to explain the Reformation. The share of politics is not overlooked. The following sentence arrests attention: "The papacy had become an Italian state before the church in England had become an English church." (P. 175-6.) Quite so; but is it not still more important to understand that the papacy was always something more than an Italian state? The book is weighty with references and will undoubtedly stand as the best work on Wolsey yet published.

This is not meant as a slight on Mr. Belloc, whose book under the same title is a joy from beginning to end. (*Wolsey*, Cassell, 15s.) We can imagine him stretching himself some morning perhaps after another dream of scything meadows—and crying out: “It is time they heard Hilaire again.” Down he sits and draws a map. Then rising, he rouses himself to a fine fury, uncorks his most heady eloquence, and out it pours gleaming and sparkling, spirited and inspiring. Of course, no one can keep it up for long, and we have to submit to some tiring details of general European history. Still the book is remarkable in its dramatic arrangement and its interest. Does Mr. Belloc give the secret of Wolsey’s greatness and the real reason of his fall? One wonders! One could maintain that Wolsey was truly great only when he fell—previously he had been merely very able and very energetic. Was his fall the result of lack of vision, which Mr. Belloc thinks to have been his fatal weakness? At least he refused to follow Henry in throwing over the old religion, and whether or not that was lack of vision, his last fidelity to God rather than to his king is an interesting starting point in the new order of things in England.

The only fault one has to find with the book is Mr. Belloc’s continued contempt for giving references. It is in this respect rather than in any better estimate of character that Mr. Pollard’s advantage lies.

Volume XIX of Pastor’s *History of the Popes* makes as good a book as one could wish for. Apart from Gregory XIII himself we have on the stage such characters as St. Charles Borromeo, St. Philip Neri and Baronius, St. Theresa of Spain, Cardinal Allen, Fathers Campion and Persons, Catherine de Medici and Mary Queen of Scots. In such company we see the revival of Catholic sanctity in Italy and Spain, and for the understanding of Catholicism it would be more useful to read two volumes on St. Theresa than two on Wolsey.

We have an interesting account of the attempts to afford a supply of priests for England by the establishment of seminaries abroad, and quite clearly the men who faced the training before they faced the rack and gallows at the end of it, were by no means mentally anæmic. It seems to be hard to convince our fellow-countrymen that religion was their main aim, and in consequence the space given to showing that they did not die for politics is not wasted. The chapter on the massacre of St. Bartholomew is extremely valuable. The topic is still a sore one with the bitter anti-Catholic. Happily the unhistorical garbage on which such minds have fed is gradually being destroyed.

Volume XX of the same work is also published this year, bringing the history down to the death of Gregory XIII in 1585. The revolt in the Netherlands is dealt with, the Catholic revival in Southern Germany and in Poland, and there are two excellent chapters on foreign missions in China, Japan, and Spanish America. As one reads the list of authorities consulted in the production of these volumes and notes the scientific method

adopted by which the reference to authorities gives real weight to his statements, one can but regret still more the loss which Catholics have suffered by the death of this great scholar. How much his work was needed is shown by the miserable trash foisted upon a too-trusting public in such books as W. H. Hudson's *Story of the Renaissance*. Fr. Kerr's translation is published by Messrs. Kegan Paul Trench Trubner and Co. in London, and though 15s. looks a good deal when there are so many volumes, the books are well worth the money.

The same firm publishes the last volume of Monsignor Mann's gallant work, bringing it down to 1276, within a quarter of a century of the beginning of Pastor.

It promises well for our history libraries that we are to have another general Church history of considerable size in an English translation. Fr. Newton Thompson is bringing out Mourret's well-known *Histoire de l'Eglise* in ten volumes. He very wisely begins with volume five—*The Renaissance and Reformation*, which is of chief interest to English speaking people. The work is the outcome of American energy and enterprise, and consequently we have occasional surprises in spelling and expression, but the book is very readable, and the great advantage of Mourret is that he covers the whole subject. It is published by Herder at 16s. a volume.

Two original works by English scholars deserve special mention, and they have an interesting relation—both books deal with comparatively modern Councils and both authors belong to what we may call the Benedictine school, for though Mr. Evennett is not a Benedictine, he is a product of Benedictine training. Dom Butler gives us two volumes on *The Vatican Council*, and in doing so, has put an end to some silly talk. No one who reads Abbot Butler can doubt the freedom with which the question of Papal Infallibility was discussed and the freedom with which the decision was made—still less the loyalty of the bishops.

Mr. Evennett is one of a trio of Catholic Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, from whose brilliance Catholics may expect great work in the future. Mr. Evennett's book on *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* is a scholarly work—his bibliographical list will make many an energetic man feel a complete idler. The book is to have a special review, I am told, so I shall but say of it that the scholarly method, the immense knowledge and a vividly interesting style in writing should win for it a great success, and I fear no rebuke from the reviewer. The Cambridge University Press publishes the book at 25s.

There are also many important continental productions—*Ambrosius von Mailand* (E. Hirsch and H. Lietzmann); *Il Cardinale Alberoni* (P. Castagnoli); *San Francisco de Asis* (P. Luis de Sarasola), but, no doubt, readers will have a sufficient selection for the time being.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, PH.D., M.A.

BLESSED SACRAMENT INDULGENCES.

1. Extraordinary indulgences for the Rosary and the Divine Office are associated with two recent Eucharistic Congresses.

At the petition of the clergy assembled in a National Eucharistic Congress at Loreto, a Plenary Indulgence on the usual conditions has been granted in perpetuity to all clerics in Sacred Orders, who recite the whole of the Divine Office, whether continuously or in parts, in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed or in the tabernacle. (S. Penitentiary, October 23rd, 1930.)

2. Before an earlier Congress at Bologna, about to hold its sessions in the Basilica, which enshrines the body of S. Dominic, the Master General of the Dominicans obtained a similar concession for the recital of the Rosary. A Plenary Indulgence may be gained by all who, after a good Confession and Holy Communion, recite a third part of the Rosary before the Blessed Sacrament exposed or in the tabernacle. The indulgence may be gained as often as the conditions are fulfilled. (Apostolic Letter, September 4th, 1927, published in December, 1928.)

3. In *Epistles* addressed to Papal Legates (*Acta*, June-October, 1930), the Holy Father confirms the grant of extensive favours promulgated by Apostolic Letter of March 7th, 1924. The Letter constitutes a charter of indulgences, privileges, indults and dispensations for all Eucharistic Congresses, whether international, national, regional or diocesan. The same favours, with the exception of the Papal Blessing, are accorded to smaller Eucharistic Congresses held by permission of the Ordinary in a single deanery or district or even in a single parish.

BENEFICES AND THE HOLY SEE.

An appointment may belong to the Holy See by reservation (The Code, canons 396, 1435) or by devolution (canon 1432, §3). A Provost, for instance, the only Dignitary of an English Chapter, and anyone who succeeds a Cardinal or Monsignore in the possession of a benefice, must be appointed by the Holy See.

The following regulations, drawn up by the Apostolic Datary on November 11th, 1930, are intended to facilitate the work of Ordinaries in applying for such appointments, and to secure a free and satisfactory choice by the Holy See.

1. An interval must be left before recourse is had to the Holy See in order that the clergy of the diocese may receive timely notice of such reservation.

2. The Ordinary must transmit to the Cardinal Datarý the names of all applicants with information concerning age and studies, life and character, previous record and suitability; and should note at least three, if possible, as *digniores*.

3. If a *concurſus* is required by the terms of the foundation, the report of the examiners should be forwarded along with the above information, and the record of the examination should be kept in the episcopal Curia. If the obligation of expounding Sacred Scripture is attached to the benefice, the candidate must be a licentiate or doctor of Sacred Scripture (*Motu Proprio*, April 27th, 1924). If the Ordinary seeks a dispensation from this rule, a testimony to the candidate's knowledge of Sacred Scripture should be added, *onerata conscientia Ordinarii*.

4. If the cure of souls attaches to a benefice, the judgment of the Ordinary concerning each candidate's knowledge, piety, zeal and fitness to govern a parish must be given, *graviter onerata conscientia Ordinarii*, since the more suitable candidate alone must be preferred. (The Code, canon 459.)

THE MISSA PRO POPULO ON SUPPRESSED FEASTS.

At the instance of the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, the Sacred Congregation of the Council has issued a decree concerning the obligation of the *Missa pro Populo* on suppressed feasts. In Spain the feasts of St. Antony of Padua, St. Isidore the Husbandman, St. Augustine, Doctor, and St. Ferdinand, King, were formerly of precept *ex iure particulari*. But no mention of these feasts occurs in the decree of December 28th, 1919. Hence it was widely argued that the obligation no longer existed. The Sacred Congregation reasserts the obligation, and explains its decision by transcribing the *votum* of a consultor as part of the new decree of July 19th, 1930, published on December 1st. The following is a summary.

The Commission for the Interpretation of the Code declared on February 17th, 1918, that the Code did not set out to change the current discipline governing the application of Mass on suppressed feasts. Also the precept waived by canon 1247, §2, clearly is not that of the *Missa pro Populo*, as the context shows. Mass must be offered for the people on all the days enumerated in the list of December 28th, 1919. They include two local feasts, *dies S. Patroni Regni*, *dies S. Patroni loci*, but as these are imposed by a general law, they too are *iuris communis*.

The list ignores feasts which are *iuris particularis*. Hence the controversy. In the first place, however, silence is not of itself a conclusive argument. Moreover, the decree does not constitute a complete body of law. It expressly refers to pre-existing law, and cites the words of the Commission which declared that the Code had made no innovation in this matter. It speaks constantly of feasts *in universali Ecclesia*; the decree of Urban VIII on which it is based has precisely the same limitation.

Furthermore, a little consideration will show that it is not

really a question of particular law. The *origin* of a local feast differs from that of a universal feast, but the *nature* of both is the same. Both imply the same obligations: hearing Mass, abstaining from servile works, and offering Mass for the people. A "suppressed" feast is one which has lost the first and second, but not the third, since canon 339, §1 (cf. 466), declares: (*Applicandam esse Missam, pro populo*) in dominicis aliisque diebus festis de præcepto, etiam suppressis.

Finally the alleged distinction between local and universal feasts would have to be proved by some authentic document. Yet the only document available ignores the distinction. A Brief of Pius VII, dated April 10th, 1818, reduced the number of Holidays of Obligation in the Kingdom of Naples by suppressing some which were local and others of universal obligation. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, when interrogated on this point, did not discriminate between the two classes, but declared that the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* on the suppressed feasts still remained. (S.R.C., October 18th, 1818.)

RUTHENIANS IN CANADA.

Recent legislation for Orientals has a special interest for all priests who are working in large cities. It is useful to know what aids are already provided, and what advice should be given, especially on such subjects as Mass, Confession and Holy Communion. Such legislation as the following, therefore, is not without practical value even in England.

A Græco-Ruthenian Ordinary was appointed in 1912, with jurisdiction over all Catholics of the Græco-Ruthenian rite in Canada. Temporary regulations were made by the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, *ad decennium*. These are now supplanted by a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, dated May 24th, 1930, which does for Canada what was done for the United States by a decree of March 1st, 1929. The Ordinary is to reside in Winnipeg. He is to appoint an advisory council of at least four consultants. He is to conduct rigorous visitations of Ruthenian parishes; to ensure a uniform observance of the Græco-Ruthenian rite; to correct abuses; to enforce an efficient administration in temporals; to send quinquennial reports to the Holy See through the Apostolic Delegate for Canada.

Vocations are to be fostered, and at least a junior seminary begun as soon as possible, *adiuvantibus aliquot saltem episcopis regionis Canadensis*. Aspirants must make a promise of celibacy, and must take an oath to remain under the jurisdiction of the Ruthenian Ordinary in Canada. To meet the present shortage the Ordinary may ask for priests from other Ruthenian or from Canadian bishops, but faculties must not be granted to any who present themselves without the consent of their own Ordinaries, nor again to Ruthenians who are not *coelibes vel saltem vidui sine liberis*.

The faithful must be warned of their duty to keep the laws of their own rite, to attend and support their own churches. Those who are too far from a Ruthenian church must be warned of the grave obligation of attending Mass and frequenting the Sacraments in a church of the Latin rite. They must not be compelled to *change* their rite in violation of the canons; and any such transfer, if desired, must be in accordance with the decree of December 6th, 1928.

Both Latin and Græco-Ruthenian penitents may validly and lawfully make their Confession to a priest of *either* rite, even if a priest of their own rite be at hand. No matter what one's own rite may be, it is permitted, *pietatis causa*, to receive the Holy Eucharist consecrated in any Catholic rite whatsoever. Likewise, if there is an urgent need and no priest of the other rite is at hand, a Græco-Ruthenian priest may distribute the Holy Eucharist which has been consecrated in unleavened bread, or a Latin priest the Holy Eucharist consecrated in leavened bread; but each must use his own rite in the distribution.

Marriages between Latin and Græco-Ruthenian Catholics are not forbidden, but the provisions of the decree *Ne temere* must be observed in these, just as in marriages between Græco-Ruthenians. The children are to be baptized in the rite of the father, and the parish priest of the father has jurisdiction over all legitimate children.

CONDEMNATION BY THE HOLY OFFICE.

JOSEPH TURMEL, of the archdiocese of Rennes, is declared *excommunicatus vitandus*, and degraded, by decree of the Holy Office, November 8th, 1930, and twelve works, published by him under false names, are placed on the *Index*. Two bear English titles: "The Latin Church in the Middle Age," by André Lagarde, Edinburgh, 1925, and "The Life of the Devil," by Louis Coulange, London, 1929. Previous condemnations, after each of which the author submitted, resulted in the proscription of seven works published in his own name. Two others professed to be written by "A. Dupin" and "G. Herzog."

He was deprived of his post as Professor in the Seminary as far back as 1892. The decree outlines his career during these forty years, and declares that he has at last admitted writing many articles and fourteen works under the following fourteen pseudonyms: Louis Coulange, Henri Delafosse, Armand Dulac, Antoine Dupin, Hippolyte Gallerande, Guillaume Herzog, André Lagarde, Robert Lawson, Denis Lenain, Paul Letourneur, Goulven Lézurec, Alphonse Michel, Edmond Perrin, Alexis Vanbeck.

Five works by PAUL ROUE were placed on the *Index* by decree of November 21st, 1930:—"Le Procès de Jésus, Etude historique et juridique," "Le Procès de Judas dit l'Iscaïot," "Code de l'union libre (Amants, Maîtresses, Enfants naturels)," "Traité de l'annulation du mariage religieux," "Mon formulaire d'actes sous-seings privés."

BOOK REVIEWS

The Criminal. By Henry A. Geisert.—B. Herder Book Co.
10s. 6d. net.

Reviewed by Rev. J. M. MUSGRAVE.

Occasionally a book comes into our hands, and after reading it we say "That is the best book I have ever read dealing with this subject, I must get it and keep it." Such appears to me to be the book of Father Geisert, who was for eight years a chaplain of a prison in St. Louis, U.S.A. It is not a book of tales of queer or horrid persons, it is not a book of memoirs like most of the books about criminals, but it is a presentation of the cause of crime, and a study of the sources which lead to instability of character. The work of Father Geisert shows a search for the breeding-ground of social evils and a diagnosis of specific weaknesses which result in moral shipwreck and social ruin. It is a work for the moralist and the student of sociology.

To the moralist who examines and apportions the amount of malice in evil actions, the book is one long treatise on human acts, with cases ranging from deep deliberate malice to the slightest of faults, and showing how the malice of an act may be modified by ignorance, environment and physical conditions.

In the second chapter of the first part the author asks "Who is a criminal?" The question is not nearly so easy to answer as it would seem. Here the definition given is "Any man who wilfully perpetrates a deed punishable by law is a criminal"; and he adds: "A man may do a deed punishable by law; he may never be discovered or he may escape his just deserts; he may never wear the convict's garb; yet he is a criminal in the true sense, for it is what we do, not where we are, that constitutes criminality." In the preface he says: "I found the great vital question 'Why did this man become antisocial?' unanswered." On the other hand we have Harris and Agabeg in *Principles of Criminal Law* stating on page 4, ed. 3: "The moral nature of an act is an element of no value in determining whether it is criminal or not. On the one hand, an act may be grossly immoral, and yet it may not bring its agent within the pale of the criminal law—as in the case of adultery." "Human laws are made, not to punish sin, but to prevent crime and mischief" (Attorney-General v. Sillem, 2H&C. 526). "On the other hand, an act perfectly innocent from a moral point of view, may render the doer amenable to punishment as a criminal. To take an extreme example: W. was convicted on an indictment for a common nuisance, for erecting an embankment which, although it was in some degree a hindrance to navigation, was advantageous in a greater degree to the users of the port. Here the motive if not praiseworthy, was at least innocent. The fact that the motive of the defendant was

positively pious and laudable has not prevented a conviction."

From the first account of Father Geisert you may think of the criminal as something apart from the rest of the community, while from the second account the criminal may be an accident. The interesting points to remember are: that a crime may be a sin or not; a sin may be a crime or not. As a sin is not synonymous with a crime, a sinner is not necessarily a criminal, nor a criminal a sinner. A sin is always an offence against God; and it may be an offence against ourselves, or our neighbour. It is only offences against our neighbour that are called antisocial and punished by prison; and it is, therefore, these offences which give the stigma of criminal. A man with a light crime may be a great sinner, while the man with a grave crime may be a light sinner. Father Geisert gives an example of this on page 10, reported from Berlin: "A blacksmith bothered with two corns, laboured particularly hard on a sultry day, his corns aching intensely. He rode the street-car home in the evening, and as he stood in the crowd, a new passenger boarded the car. The jolt of the starting car caused the latter to lose his balance and to step inadvertently on the blacksmith's corns. Infuriated with pain, the farrier struck the offender a terrific blow, knocking him and two others from the moving car. All three fractured their skulls and died within a day." He comments that while legally guilty of a triple murder, the man cannot be held guilty morally of more than an assault, and adds: "What I wish to make clear is that a physical defect, aching corns, was a vital factor in causing an offence which had disastrous results."

This book is notable for the way it presents the types of mind that are the product of prisons; the types of mind that characterise the habitual criminal. And these types are bred in the reformatories and industrial schools, and in the streets and factories and night-clubs, so that it often happens that the first visit of a man to a prison shows that he has already fully developed this antisocial outlook. The difficulty is in checking beginnings, and in recognizing them as such. Nearly all the habitual criminals start with venial sins, which are a nuisance to Society, and under punishment develop a definite antisocial bias; and if they start with slight faults, their rapid deterioration and final ruin is awful to contemplate.

The book is of American origin, but, as a sincere piece of work, on a phase of human nature which is found in all civilized countries, is, therefore, substantially true and applicable everywhere, and I should recommend it to all who educate youth and social workers, for throughout its 450 odd pages there are many hints of dealing with different aspects of the problem. Most of the classical ethical books have been consulted, and the index is very good, and his summary on character, habit, education is very well done. The terminology of the divisions of the book has been taken from medicine, namely: Part 1, The Etiology of Crime; Part 2, Therapeutics; Part 3, Prophylaxis

for the causes, remedies, and prevention of crime; otherwise technical terminology is not abundant, and should present no difficulty to the ordinary reader. The author gives as the two great means of prevention, education and religion, but urges that natural means should be taken as well as supernatural, and that his volume is a discussion of the Psychology of Crime and not theological. This explains why parts of the treatise are elementary, while most of the treatise is highly specialized.

Clergymen are frequently called upon, without experience or warning, by their profession to deal with criminal cases. It will be a useful thing to have this book of Father Geisert at hand to study or consult.

Martin Luther, His Life and Work. By Hartmann Grisar, S.J.—Adapted from the second German edition by Frank J. Eble, M.A.—Edited by Arthur Preuss.—Herder, pp. 609.—17s. 6d.

Reviewed by the REV. PHILIP HUGHES, L.S.H.

THE Lutheran Archbishop of Upsala, Dr. Söderblom, lecturing a few years ago, declared with truth that modern Catholic research "has brought about a radical revolution in the conception of Luther." It has in fact destroyed the Protestant legend, and while it leaves more evident than ever how disastrous, intellectually no less than spiritually, Luther's achievement was, it has caused Catholics also to modify many of their inherited judgments. Especially, perhaps, must we modify those we incline to form on Luther's personality and on the inner causes which transformed him from the Catholic monk to the reformer *par excellence*.

Of this revolution in "Lutherology" the chief agents have been the Dominicans, Fr. Denifle and Fr. Weiss, and the writer whose latest book is before us, Fr. Hartmann Grisar, S.J. The Dominican study, since translated into English, appeared twenty-five years ago (1904-09), and the storm of indignant criticism it roused was hardly stilled when Fr. Grisar followed suit with an even more voluminous work (English Translation in 6 volumes, 1913-17), which inaugurated yet another fruitful controversy. The present book is no mere *resumé* of the more elaborate work, but an entirely new book that takes account of all the subsequent criticism, an attempt, in Fr. Grisar's own words, "to write a uniform and well-balanced biography" such as controversial necessities previously made impossible.

Luckily for scholarship, the labours of these historians in no way overlap, for while Fr. Denifle sets out to examine critically the Protestant legend of "Dr. Martin Luther," the Jesuit is more concerned with the mind of Luther himself, and with an endeavour to reconstruct the process of his psychological and spiritual activities. The materials for such a study are almost endless, and Fr. Grisar's book is the fruit of a lifetime's familiarity with them.

And first of all, Luther himself, what kind of man was he?

His biographer discards the extravagant panegyrics of his first disciples, and the hardly less extravagant defamation of some of his Catholic opponents, and we see Luther as a human being, unusual, extraordinary, but very human all the same. From his parents he inherited an unusual nervous sensibility which the severity and brutalities of his childhood and early schooling greatly increased. Thence resulted that perpetual alternation of melancholy and gleeful buffoonery which was to be the everyday rhythm of his life. With all this, a part of it, and deriving from it, there went a wholly false conception of "the fear of God" and a habit of superstition of which devil-mania was one of the most evident signs. By the time of his adolescence he was apparently what we now call "neurotic," and Fr. Grisar can write, "We are constrained therefore to regard Luther, after the thunderbolt had driven him into the monastery, as a monk who was afflicted with an extreme case of 'nerves' and deserved commiseration; as one who, even in his subsequent career, often was sorely tried by suffering."

In reaction from these melancholy fits we have his extravagant clowning, his astonishing cocksureness ("self-confidence" hardly conveys the degree of his certainty), and, perhaps too, the amazing controversial vocabulary that spattered opponents with the filthiest of similes, and this with so rich an ease that their retorts in kind are by comparison little more than the gestures of rude schoolboys. It was in one of his melancholy fits that he entered religion—the Augustinian monastery of Erfurt, "*desperans de me ipso*," he himself tells us, "with a depressing sense of moral incompetence and the experienced inability to preserve chastity," says his biographer, who notes the resolution as "precipitous and premature." The monastic life, he further adds, "presupposes qualifications entirely at variance with Luther's undisciplined nature," and the scenes at his first Mass, when he had to be held lest he ran terrified from the altar, seem to confirm the opinion that of all men Martin Luther was the least likely to have been called to serve God in the cloister.

But Fr. Grisar does more than merely analyse Luther's mental states. He writes the full story of his long life's external activities, noting his unusual eloquence, his power of writing, and, one of his most distinctive characteristics, his superhuman energy and love of work. All this he tells against the background of the world into which Luther was born—the world, ecclesiastically, of Alexander VI and Julius II, with things Catholic in such decay that even good men despaired of reform and doubted whether it were possible. Luther's education in the religious sciences is shown to have been woefully lacking. The only philosophy he knew was the decadent Nominalism fashionable since Occam. Theology he only began to study after his ordination, and even then for a mere eighteen months, after which his superiors set him to lecture on Aristotle, with, for his Theology, what spare time he could find. Nor was he a Humanist, for he came very late to his Greek, and he was in the monastery before the New Learn-

ing began to quicken the old University where he made his studies. Such was the poor, superficial equipment with which he set himself to find in St. Augustine and in St. Paul a solution to quiet this harassed conscience. And this under the stress of external activities that crowded every hour of every day!

Was the personal catastrophe, given these symptoms, inevitable? The religious state of Germany was such that it only needed a Luther in active revolt to shiver and shatter the whole.

The story of the revolt and of the loss of Germany is here set forth with exemplary sobriety, and the facts are allowed to tell their own tale. Every shred of evidence is weighed for or against the reformer's character, and an abundance of citations refers the reader to the sources whence the book is written. It is beyond all doubt the best *life* of Luther, a book of which Catholic scholarship may well be proud, and this tempts us to dip our pen in gall to express our honest opinion of the translation, which, utterly unworthy of its great subject, preserves throughout an even barbarity of expression that amounts to a *tour de force*. The Index, too, is very poor, and we think the publisher might have provided one at any rate of Luther's portraits.

A History of the Catholic Church. By the Rev. Fernand Mourret, S.S. Translated by the Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D.—Volume Five.—(Herder, London.—16s.—Pp. vii. and 706.)

Reviewed by the VERY REV. C. L. WARING, M.A.

The appearance of a translation of Mourret will cause heart-searchings. Truly our library of English works on Church history is miserably inadequate. The translation of Funk in two volumes supplies those seminaries which can spare but a few hours from a crowded time-table for the study of Church History. Mourret's work in nine volumes is more interesting and more satisfying; and it is already used by the more insatiable seminarists. The translation may save them a little time and it will bring the work of the Abbé to a wider public. It will not end the demand for an ecclesiastical history which will give prominence to those problems which are of greatest interest to English-speaking people.

Fr. Thompson wisely begins with volume five. With its treatment of the revival of Classical studies, and the marvellous development in painting, sculpture and architecture, it is bound to appeal to all who are interested in the progress of the human race. The story of the Reformation, with the preliminary account of the Avignon residence, the great Western Schism, the triumph of the Turk, the rise of nationalism and the sad degradation of the Popes, is piquant enough to challenge any novel of modern times.

This volume, offering so large a canvas, can obviously not go into minute detail, but it gives a Catholic outline without shirking the unpleasant things which have to be said; and where non-

Catholic books have had a field so much to their liking, it is the beginning of very valuable work. Because it covers the ground more briefly than Pastor, it will be welcome to a busy world. Further, the references given will afford valuable aid to those who wish to go more deeply into the thousands of questions which call for study. We still need works which will give us, at the same time, a fuller picture of the political and social conditions, but the fact that we have not all we need, should not make us less thankful for what we have; after all, this is a fault of the original rather than of the translation.

Seeing that the work is published in America, perhaps we should not complain of occasional abbreviations in spelling, of what, to us, is a strange use of the word "quit," of the unusual "legist," of the "hell of fire" (p. 110), and the "bolt of lightning" (p. 312), of the murder of "hung," the loss of the correct preposition after "showered" (p. 308), and the invention of a real novelty in "blusterously" (p. 74). These may be mere prejudices of an Englishman! On p. 130 he has followed the original too faithfully in speaking of William Samtre—whose name was really Sawtre; and to speak of France as "a sad but noble queen, whose crown was almost falling off" (p. 175) illustrates the unsuspected difficulties of translators. In making the imperial crown an object for collation he does but follow the translator of Pastor. Yet these are but small matters. The book reads very well and is a model of generous printing and shapeliness; and when so much that is good has been accomplished, it would be ungracious not to congratulate Fr. Thompson on his work and wish him every success with the rest of his undertaking.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

ETUDES January 5, 1931. *L'Opinion Catholique Allemande et la victoire d'Hitler*, by M. Robert d'Harcourt, deserves more than passing notice. M. d'Harcourt, Professor at the Institut Catholique of Paris, lost his right hand in the War and successfully carried out a daring escape from his prison camp. Germany and German Catholicism have no secrets for him. In his well documented article we see German Catholics sharply divided on the issues raised by Hitler's success. The weekly Catholic Review, *Die Schöner Zukunft*, published by Pustet in Ratisbon and Vienna, under the brilliant editorship of Dr. Joseph Eberle, has achieved the position of being the leading Catholic weekly in the German tongue although it has only existed some five years. It is favourable to Hitler. On the other hand we have the long-established *Allgemeine Rundschau*, edited in Munich by Dr. Moenius, a priest, well-known for his favourable outlook on Latin culture, and who dared denounce the violation of Belgian neutrality. It is using all its energy to fight the nationalist movement. M. d'Harcourt gives us a clear statement of the two extreme positions: we see Dr. Eberle throwing all the blame on the foreigners, without a word of reprobation for the extreme racialism of the Hitlerites, and stressing its legitimate and its hopeful character. We see a Germany the hope of restored authority, the embodiment of the moral forces of the Universe confronting the bad-will of a world leagued against her, the champion of mind against the coalition of material interests, leading the way to the inevitable triumph of right over might. The anti-Roman, the anti-Christian outbursts of the election campaign are simply passed over.

At the other extreme Dr. Moenius deplors the elections of September 14 as "one of the darkest days in the annals of the German Empire." In his eyes Hitlerism is but the latest manifestation of the narrow Prussian-nationalism cultivated in the Germany of Bismarck and of the Hohenzollerns. The evil does not come from without but from within. The only remedy he can see is in the administrative separation of the culturally more advanced Western and Southern parts of Germany from the Eastern.

Briefly Dr. Moenius's *mea culpa* is countered by Dr. Eberle's accusations.

M. d'Harcourt sadly concludes that the Hitler spirit is in the ascendant in spite of the line taken by the Bishop of Mainz.

ETUDES for December 20, 1930, had an interesting historical sketch of *l'idée de séparation entre l'Eglise l'Etat* by Joseph Lecler.

Father J. de Ghellinck, writing in GREGORIANUM (December, 1930): *En marge de l'œuvre de Harnack*, gives us an outline of

the brilliant career of the man who was at once a specialist and a populariser, and who for more than fifty years was an outstanding figure in the world of scholarship. The great monument to Harnack will undoubtedly remain the Berlin Edition of the Ante-Nicene Writers which was led up to by his early work, was conceived by him, and carried out with a thoroughness which has enriched us directly and indirectly with a multitude of works of the first importance. But when he came to treat of Catholic Theology his vast learning and his power of keen penetration seem to abandon him: grace, the Sacraments, Scholasticism, the Immaculate Conception are set forth with mistakes and prejudices which would startle the Catholic reader were he not already familiar with that phenomenon of the modern world—that it is only where Catholic teaching is concerned that the non-Catholic scholar may betray ignorance and not lose caste.

COLLATIONES DIOECESIS TORNACENSIS (20 frs. for eight numbers a year: Evêché de Tournai). Canon J. Warichez, in view of the fourteenth centenary of St. Eleutherius (+531), first Bishop of Tournai, begins a careful historical study of the country in which the holy man worked. There is also a sane and useful treatment (pp. 85-91), *de pudicitia et nudismo*, well worth noting in view of the rapid spread of nudist theories. More than ordinary interest, too, attaches to the article, "*L'éducation familiale*," emphasising the importance of parents taking the trouble to learn how to carry out their parental educational duties. There is an excellent Belgian review bearing the same title as the article and published in Brussels, 67, rue de l'Orme (35 Belgian francs a year).

COLLATIONES BRUGENSES for December, 1930, gives another article by V. Coucke embodying the latest medical facts *de tempore ageneseos*. The new facts supplementing those given by Schröder (Jahreskurse f. Aerztl. Fortb., 1913, vii.) and Knaus (referred to in our last number) are set out in the German *Zentralblatt für Gynæcologie*, 8, 22 Februar, 1930, p. 464, seq. by Dr. K. Ogino, Chefarzt des Gynäkologischen Abteilung des Takeyama-Krankenhauses zu Nügata, Japan. Dr. J. N. J. Smulders sets out and defends the Ogino-Knaus method in the *R. K. Artsenblad* (published from 416, Claes de Vrieselaan, Rotterdam), and his articles can be obtained in book form from N. V. Dekker and Van de Vegt, Nijmegen-Utrecht, for fl. 1.50. The October number of the same Dutch periodical contains a discussion between Dr. Smulders and Dr. Ausems.

The practical conclusion is that the doctors are still discussing and investigating and that moralists must be very prudent in giving advice.

PAX, the Monthly Review of the Benedictines of Prinknash, Gloucester (6 shillings a year) makes a new departure which deserves every encouragement. January brings us an "Eastern

Churches Number," and it is proposed that one number of each quarter shall be devoted to "Oriental" matters. J. W. McPherson writes pleasantly on "*Christmas in the Cairo Churches*," and the first of a series of articles by Father Charles Bourgeois, S.J.: "*For the Understanding of the Eastern Christians*," promises a thoughtful statement of the problems of reunion in the East. Notes and comments deal with the Catholic Abyssinians, Armenians and Malabarese, and also with Russia.

APOLOGETISCH LEVEN, edited by Prof. T. H. Mets (Seminarie, Driebergen, Holland), in the first number of the new series (October, 1930) gives us a good account of the apologetical activities of the Catholics of the Netherlands. They are on the alert, and not without reason: the census of 1849 gave Catholics 38% of the population, in 1920 they were 35.61%. A new feature appeared in that last census: 8% declared themselves "without any religion"; 16% of the inhabitants of the Hague, 22% of those of Amsterdam, 37% of the population of Zaandam described themselves in the same way. Every type of active propaganda has to be withstood, Socialistic, Communistic, Neo-Malthusian, anti-Militarist, Atheistic, etc. *Het St. Johanneswerk in het "Zonnehuis" te Bilthoven* is an account of an interesting new work. The "Zonnehuis" is a private house run by Dr. and Mrs. Oomen-Kuller (12, Sweelincklaan, Bilthoven, Holland) for the reception of non-Catholic enquirers where they can talk matters over with Catholic laypeople and make such enquiries as it might be difficult for them to make under ordinary circumstances. It is not a Retreat-house, there are no sermons or controversial discussions, but a restful atmosphere is provided for seekers. The account quoted from the *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant* of Protestant activities in Belgium was a disturbing one (pp. 56-58), but in the January, 1931, number a letter from the Dominican Prior in Antwerp, Father R. Pauwels, assures us that the actual results from those activities is practically nil.

ONS GELOOF is an excellent Flemish apologetical monthly, and publishes an ecclesiastical supplement: *Pastor Bonus*, every two months (35 francs a year: 23, Ploegstraat, Antwerp). In the October number, Father James M. Van de Vijvere, O.P., writes on "*De H. Thomas van Aquino en de onthouding van bedwelmende dranken*." The article is well documented, and an outline of its contents may be useful.

(1) After setting out St. Thomas' teaching on the need for man of a reasonable measure of relaxation and enjoyment,

(2) We are shown that the use of wine is not forbidden by him, though he recognizes that a slight excess may occasion great harm (2.2, 149, a.1) and that sobriety is to be commended, particularly to all in administrative and ecclesiastical positions (*ibid.*, a.4). But circumstances may render the use of wine illicit: a person may know that wine is bad for him, or he may

have vowed not to take it, or again he may know that he easily takes too much, or his taking it may be a source of scandal to others (*ibid*, a.3).

Thus we find St. Thomas linking total abstinence with the evangelical counsels and the seeking of perfection: "Secondly, a man may have wisdom in some degree of perfection; and in this way in order to receive wisdom perfectly, *it is required of* certain persons that they abstain altogether from wine, according to circumstances of persons and places" (2.2, q. 149, a.3 and 1). He makes his meaning quite clear: "Christ withdraws us from some things as being altogether unlawful, and from others as being obstacles to perfection. It is in the latter way that he withdraws some from the use of wine, on account of their aiming at perfection, even as from riches and the like."

CORRESPONDENCE

(1) MISSA PRO POPULO AND MASS-STIPENDS.

The Rector of a parish in which each of the two priests had to binate every Sunday, received stipends for three Masses, the donors wishing them to be said on the following Sunday, if possible.

The Rector, knowing himself to be bound to the Missa pro Populo, considered that only one of the Masses could be said on that day.

When giving the stipend to his curate he mentioned his difficulty to him.

The Curate, however, said that the matter was easily to be arranged if the Rector would give him two of the stipends and keep one for himself. The Curate would then say one of his two Masses for the given intention, and apply his free Mass for the People, on behalf of the Rector.

The Rector would thus be free to accept the stipend for the Mass which he retained, and his free Mass could be offered for the Curate's intention, which would be that of the third Mass asked for.

The Rector could find no flaw in this argument, but wondered what a Canonist would say of it.

Reply

The law which forbids accepting a second stipend on the occasion of duplicating is stated in Canon 824, §2: "Quoties pluries in die celebrat, si unam Missam ex titulo justitiæ applicet, sacerdos, præterquam in die Nativitatis Domini, pro alia eleemosynam recipere nequit, excepta aliqua retributione ex titulo extrinseco." In parishes, therefore, where the rector and curate both duplicate, only one stipend can be accepted on Sundays; the parish priest cannot accept a second because he has an obligation in justice to say Mass "pro populo"; the curate cannot accept a second because he has an obligation in justice arising from his acceptance of the first. But most priests feel that, if it were possible, they would like to oblige a parishioner who desires a Mass to be said on Sunday. There may exist good reasons for seeking a dispensation from this law, and in some dioceses an Indult is obtained, usually on the condition of passing over the offering accepted to some charitable work. (Cf. *Collationes Brugenses*, 1929, p. 209.) The present case does not touch this principle, nor has it anything to do with the intricate question of "extrinsic title." Instead, a most ingenious solution is suggested, requiring some thought, by which the parish priest says two of the Masses and receives one stipend, while the curate says one of the Masses and receives two stipends. It does not

appear to break any canonical rule Canon 825 is not violated, "Nunquam licet duplicem eleemosynam pro eiusdem Missæ applicatione accipere," because the curate receives the extra stipend as a gift from the parish priest to whom it really belongs. It does not appear to be forbidden by Canon 824, §2, quoted above, because the curate's second Mass is "*pro populo*," to which he is not strictly bound *ex iustitia*; and the parish priest's second Mass is said gratuitously for the curate, who keeps the stipend attached to it.

Nevertheless, in spite of these evasions of the obvious meaning of the law, the transaction is gravely unlawful. In the first place, the obligation of the Missa *pro populo* is a *personal* one and the parish priest is not excused from saying it personally except for a proportionately grave reason (*e.g.*, legitimate absence, Can. 466, §5). There is clearly no sufficient reason of this kind, in the case presented. It is also a *real* obligation, arising from the relations between the parish and the priest it is supporting, by which the parishioners have a right in justice to *certain* Masses said by *some priest or other*. The Canon Law determines accurately the number of Masses to be said, but the obligation is not purely one of positive law, as the Holy See has often determined. Therefore, if a parish priest is unable to say Mass personally, *e.g.*, because of illness, a Mass must be said by *some priest* on a title of justice towards the parish. This is the kernel of the case. The curate in undertaking the Missa *pro populo*, even without a stipend, assumes the real obligation *ex iustitia* towards the parish, although towards the parish priest it may be technically *ex caritate* or *ex fidelitate*. This point is perhaps not too evident, but it may be made clearer from analogous examples. The caretaker of an estate has certain duties to perform on a title of justice; a friend may undertake them *ex caritate* towards the caretaker, but they are due *ex iustitia* towards the estate. Or again, a priest with care of souls is bound to succour the dying *ex iustitia*; a visiting priest may assume the responsibility *ex caritate*, but his obligation of assisting the dying is *ex iustitia* towards the dying. (Keller, *Mass Stipends*, p. 45.)

The transaction breaks the law of Canon 824, §2. The amount of a usual Mass offering is due to the curate who assumes the obligation of the parish priest. This is the common custom always observed. If the custom had been observed in this case, the law would be apparent beyond all dispute, and only one of the three Mass offerings could have been accepted. But the custom was not observed, and it has required a little argument to prove that, nevertheless, only one offering can lawfully be taken.

E. J. M.

(2) HOLYDAYS OF OBLIGATION.

Parochus, in response to a request from a small number of zealous parishioners, declines to provide a Mass at an unusually early hour on Holydays of Obligation falling on week-days, on the express ground that by so doing he would put a larger number

of his people, who have to go to work very early, into bad faith. At present they are lawfully excused, there being no Mass they can attend. Parochus maintains that he has no right to place a burden on them—which in fact most of them would decline—beyond that which the common custom of the country imposes, and which their fellow-Catholics in other parishes do not have to bear. What is to be thought of Parochus' action?

Reply

The intention of the parish priest is an excellent one. The good faith of the people who may, perhaps incorrectly, consider themselves excused from hearing Mass on some half-dozen occasions during the year, is certainly to be preserved, *ceteris paribus*. But, it seems to me, the means proposed for securing this end are not to be approved. "Optandum quidem esset ut festorum observantia accurata inter nos vigeret; sed cum difficile sit a servilibus operibus abstinere, iis maxime qui ab heris protestantibus dependent, enixe adlaborandum, ut fideles iis diebus, si infra hebdomadam cadunt, saltem Missæ assistant. Ac propterea debent Missionarii, si fieri potest, ad satisfaciendum eorum devotioni, saltem unam Missam diluculo celebrandam curare" (Decretum XXIII. Conc. Prov. West. I).

If Mass is said at an early hour, as the decree determines, many of the less devout would regret the change, but would nevertheless make some effort to be present. Others, undoubtedly, would not do so. It is possible to preserve their good faith by allowing them to believe that they are excused for an adequate reason. The authors are surprisingly liberal in estimating what is a sufficient reason. "Excusat a Missa audienda quævis causa mediocriter gravis, seu quæ involvit mediocre quoddam incommodum vel damnum in bonis animæ vel corporis proprii vel proximi." (Ferrerres, *Theol. Moralis* I, §441. Cf. also the examples given by Tanqueray, *Theol. Moralis* II, §1032, which appear to be unusually liberal.) This doctrine concerning the excusing cause and, still more, the principle with regard to leaving people in good faith, needs to be interpreted with the provision that no scandal is caused. It could be avoided by publicly warning the congregation that people who feel unable to take advantage of the early Mass should consult a priest about their obligation. The devout who attend would then have to form a charitable judgment concerning the absence of their neighbours. The priest who gave advice to individuals could prudently apply the principle of leaving them in good faith. In addition, a parish priest may dispense from the law in particular cases, provided there is an adequate reason for doing so. "Non solum Ordinarii locorum, sed etiam parochi, in casibus singularibus justaque de causa, possunt subiectos sibi singulos fideles singulasve familias, etiam extra territorium, atque in suo territorio etiam peregrinos, a lege communi de observantia festorum . . . dispensare." (Canon 1245. §1.) I should not like to commit myself to the statement that "leaving a person in good faith" is a sufficient cause, but there

would surely be other reasons as well. (Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1930, p. 743.) E.J.M.

(3) ASH WEDNESDAY.

On Ash Wednesday should nuns receive the blessed ashes on the forehead below the "bandeau," or is it more correct to sprinkle the ashes upon the veil "in summitate capitis"?

Reply

The rubric of the Missal does not determine precisely how the ashes are to be sprinkled: "sibi ipsi cineres imponit in capite . . . primo imponit cineres digniori sacerdoti deinde ministris . . . alii singulatim recipiunt cineres a sacerdote ut dictum est de ministris." The rubricists interpret these directions in accordance with local customs. Thus Callewaert: "De cetero servetur consuetudo ut vel imponantur supra capillos viris et etiam si commode fieri possit foeminis, vel ut apud nostrates fieri solet tactu physico affricentur cineres, per modum crucis, laicis in frontem, clericis vero in tonsuram." (*Ceremoniale Bruges*, 1922.) The custom has arisen, universal amongst us in England, of sprinkling the ashes on the top of the head in the case of clerics, and it is to be traced to the still more ancient custom of sprinkling the ashes on the tonsure. In other places clerics who do not wear the tonsure may receive the ashes on the forehead. (*L'Ami du Clergé*, 1919, p. 816.) Some regard it is allowable, in the case of women whose heads are covered, to sprinkle the hair in front (De Herdt III, 22), but the custom of marking the forehead with the sign of the cross, in the case of *all the faithful who are not clerics*, is now almost universal and should be continued.

Now, one thing is quite evident. All these interpretations are guided by the principle that the ashes should be on the person's head and not on their hats or veils. Therefore, nuns should receive the ashes on the forehead, and it is incorrect to sprinkle the top of the head over the veil. (*Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. 32, p. 309.) It is a point to which the founders of certain religious communities did not advert when they designed the religious habit and veil; in some cases the *bandeau* covers nearly the whole of the forehead.

E. J. MAHONEY.

